FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-180
Monday
17 September 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-180 CONTENTS *17 September 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Nuclear Test Ban Urged, Research Defended *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Sep]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Soviet Envoy Assails Iraq at UN Session *[TASS]* 3
Soviet, UK Commanders Meet in Germany *[KRASNAYA ZVEDA 14 Sep]* 3
Genscher, De Maiziere Address Ministers *[IZVESTIYA 14 Sep]* 3
German Settlement News Conference Reported *[IZVESTIYA 14 Sep]* 4
Warsaw Pact's Lobov Receives NATO Delegation *[KRASNAYA ZVEDA 13 Sep]* 5
Warsaw Pact, NATO Officials Begin Talks *[TASS]* 5
Shevardnadze To Address United Nations *[TASS]* 6
TASS Reports Gerasimov's 14 Sep Briefing 6
    Views Status of Iraqi Students 6
    Reviews Baker-Shevardnadze Talks 6
    Discusses Arms Conference 7
    Previews Italian Minister's Visit 7
    Reports on Chernobyl Shelter 7
'Observers Roundtable' Views Week's Events 16 Sep *[Moscow Radio]* 7
'International Situation' Program Aired 14 Sep *[Moscow Radio]* 9

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Baker, Mosbacher Visit to Moscow Assessed 12
    New Forms of Trade Sought *[PRAVDA 14 Sep]* 12
    Obukhov Calls Ties 'Promising' *[TASS]* 12
Ryzhkov-Mosbacher Talks Viewed *[PRAVDA 14 Sep]* 13
Primakov Discusses U.S. Relations at Seminar *[TASS]* 13

China

Shevardnadze Sees 'New Quality' in PRC Ties *[Moscow TV]* 13
Ministerial Talks on PRC Ties Open in Moscow 14
    Armed Forces Cuts Discussed *[TASS]* 14
    'Constructive Attitude' Seen *[Moscow International]* 14
Soviet-Chinese Rail Connection Completed *[Moscow TV]* 15
Kim Il-song's Reported PRC Visit Unconfirmed *[Moscow International]* 15

Northeast Asia

Establishment of Formal Ties With ROK Viewed *[Moscow International]* 15
Relations Formed Between Soviet-ROK Cities *[Moscow International]* 16
Ties With Japan, Gorbachev's Planned Visit Noted *[Moscow International]* 16

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentaries on Cambodian Settlement Continue 17
    Cambodian Premier Calls Meeting *[Moscow International]* 17

  - 'Major Breakthrough' Toward Peace *[PRAVDA 13 Sep]* ... 18

Near East & South Asia

- Yazov Says Alliance With Iraq Ended in 1972 *[Tokyo KYODO 17 Sep]* ... 18
- Israeli Ministers Continue Visit to Moscow ... 19
  - Delegates Meet With Gorbachev *[Jerusalem Radio]* ... 19
  - Gorbachev on Strengthening Ties *[Jerusalem Radio]* ... 19
  - Ministers Meet Yakovlev, Pavlov *[Jerusalem Radio]* ... 20
  - Ministry Summarizes Consultations *[TASS]* ... 20
  - Talks Termed 'Very Useful' *[Jerusalem Radio]* ... 20
  - 'Meaningful Breakthrough' Seen *[Jerusalem Radio]* ... 20
- Interviews With Israeli Ministers on Talks ... 21
  - Moda'i Discusses Economic Ties *[Jerusalem Radio]* ... 21
  - Science Minister on Relations *[Jerusalem Radio]* ... 22
- Israeli Housing Minister Sharon's Visit Assailed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Sep]* ... 22
- Saudi Foreign Minister Prince Sa'ud Arrives ... 23
  - To Establish Diplomatic Ties *[TASS]* ... 23
  - Welcomed by Shevardnadze *[TASS]* ... 23
  - Begins Discussions 17 Sep *[TASS]* ... 24
  - Supports Normalized Relations *[TASS]* ... 24
  - Calls for Iraqi Withdrawal *[TASS]* ... 24
- Gorbachev, Mitterrand Converse About Gulf Crisis *[TASS]* ... 24
- Reports Continue on Persian Gulf Crisis ... 25
  - Foreign Ministry on Kidnappings *[TASS]* ... 25
  - UN Approves Food Aid *[TASS]* ... 25
- Training of Iraqi Servicemen in USSR Assessed *[TASS]* ... 26
- Commentaries Evaluate Persian Gulf Crisis ... 26
  - 'Supremacy of Rule by Fist' *[Moscow TV]* ... 26
  - 'Secrets' Surround Soviet Role *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 37]* ... 26
- Europe 'Cool' Toward Calls for Bigger Gulf Role *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* ... 29
- Departure of Specialists From Iraq Examined ... 29
  - Specialist Interviewed *[SOYUZ No 36]* ... 29
  - Said To Face Dangers in Iraq *[Moscow Radio]* ... 31
- Reports, Comments on U.S. Role in Persian Gulf ... 31
  - Bush's Iraqi TV Address Noted *[TASS]* ... 31
  - Iran May Support Baghdad *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Sep]* ... 31
  - Impact on U.S. Policy Examined *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Sep]* ... 32

Sub-Saharan Africa

- Settlement of Angolan Conflict Examined ... 33
  - Arms to Rebels Said To Bar Peace *[IZVESTIYA 9 Sep]* ... 33
  - Anglolan-South African Ties Eyed *[Moscow International]* ... 34
- South African Unrest, Opposition Reviewed *[Moscow International]* ... 35
- Ethiopian Opposition Group Threatens Secession *[Moscow International]* ... 35
- Yanayev Receives Zimbabwean Politburo Member *[TASS]* ... 36

East Europe

- 'Expert' Discusses East Europe Economic Reform *[Prague HOSPODARSKE NOVINY 7 Sep]* ... 36
- Lukyanov Receives Hungarian Envoy for Talks *[Budapest MTI]* ... 39
- Rehabilitation Cooperation Planned With GDR *[East Berlin ADN]* ... 39

West Europe

- Italy's De Michelis Conducts Visit to Moscow ... 39
  - Opens Talks With Shevardnadze *[TASS]* ... 39
  - Foresees Friendship Treaty *[Rome ANSA]* ... 39
  - States Views on Gulf Crisis *[TASS]* ... 40
  - Remarks on Israeli Relations *[TASS]* ... 40

  - Outlines Cooperation Prospects *[TASS]* 41
  - Announces Credit to Moscow *[AFP]* 41
  - Confers With Gorbachev 15 Sep *[Moscow Radio]* 41
  - Calls Talks 'Exceptionally Useful' *[IZVESTIYA 17 Sep]* 42
- 'Text' of Soviet-Italian Communique Released *[IZVESTIYA 17 Sep]* 42
- British Foreign Secretary Hurd Continues Visit 43
  - Meets With Yeltsin 13 Sep *[IZVESTIYA 15 Sep]* 43
  - Received by Gorbachev 14 Sep *[Moscow Radio]* 44
  - Discusses 'In-Depth' Dialogue *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 44
  - Confers With Shevardnardze *[IZVESTIYA 16 Sep]* 44
  - Holds News Conference *[TASS]* 45

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

- Moscow TV Broadcasts 14 Sep Supreme Soviet 46
  - Aganbagyan Delivers Report 46
  - Union Treaty Still Not Ready 46
- Aganbegyan Advocates Shatalin Economic Program *[TASS]* 47
- Shatalin, Abalkin Comment on Economic Program *[TASS]* 47
- Session Focuses on Economy, Destabilization *[TASS]* 48
- Proposed Agenda for Fourth Session Published *[IZVESTIYA 15 Sep]* 48
- Gorbachev Addresses 17 Sep Supreme Soviet Session *[Moscow Radio]* 49
  - Explains Transition to Market *[Moscow International]* 49
  - Rules Out Government Reshuffle *[TASS]* 50

Political & Social

- Anti-Government Rally Held in Moscow 16 Sep 50
  - Organizers Hold News Conference *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 50
  - Organizers Not Against Gorbachev *[Moscow International]* 50
  - Demonstration Held in Gorkiy Park *[Moscow International]* 51
  - Government Resignation Demanded *[AFP]* 51
  - Economic Reform Urged *[Moscow Radio]* 51
  - Demonstrators Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 52
  - Militia Says 70,000 Attended *[TASS]* 52
  - Aim for 'Civilized Communication' *[TASS]* 53
  - Value of Demonstration Questioned *[PRAVDA 17 Sep]* 53
- Moscow's Popov Discusses Purpose of Demonstration *[Moscow Radio]* 54
  - Popov on Need for New Government *[Moscow TV]* 55
  - Popov Backs Protest *[AFP]* 55
- 'Unconstitutional' Gorbachev Decree Suspended *[TASS]* 56
  - Concern Expressed Over 'Legality' *[TASS]* 56
- 'Radical' Leaders Discuss Meeting with Gorbachev *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 24 Aug]* 56
- Ryzhkov Interviewed on Market Economy Proposals *[Moscow TV]* 59
- PRAVDA Reports 13 Sep Politburo Session *[15 Sep]* 62
- Dzasokhov Interviewed on 13 Sep Politburo Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 63
- Legal Expert Criticizes Draft KGB Law *[MOSCOW NEWS No 36]* 64
- Consultations on Union Treaty Held 14 Sep *[TASS]* 66
- Cholera Outbreak Reported in Rostov Area *[IZVESTIYA 8 Sep]* 66
- Leaders Sign Writer Sofronov's Obituary *[PRAVDA 14 Sep]* 66

Economics

- Aganbegyan's Compromise Economic Plan Published *[AFP]* 66
- 'Top Priority' Program Reviews Economic Plans *[Moscow International]* 67
- Committee Reports on Absenteeism in Economy *[TASS]* 68

Scientific

- Cosmos-2100 Satellite Launched 14 Sep *[PRAVDA]* 69
- Soyuz Cosmonauts Continue Mission Experiments *[TASS]* 69
- Chernobyl Software 'Thieves' Erase Data *[TASS]* 69
- Research Ship Returns to Kaliningrad *[Moscow Radio]* 69
- TASS To Publish 'Mysterious Phenomena' Bulletin *[TASS]* 70

Military

- Moiseyev Discusses Issues Concerning Soviet Army 70
  - Collaboration With Ministries *[TASS]* 70
  - Housing of Servicemen *[PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK No 35]* 70
- Poll on Attitudes Toward Military Published *[MOSCOW NEWS No 36]* 72
  - Poll Findings Analyzed *[MOSCOW NEWS No 36]* 73
- Ulyanovsk Oblast Calls for Radar Site's Closure *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Sep]* 75

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

- Latvia Protests Iraqi Presence in Baltic Fleet *[AFP]* 76
- CPSU Politburo Issues Appeal to Lithuania *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 76
  - Landsbergis Responds to Appeal *[Vilnius Radio]* 76
- Landsbergis Speaks to Lithuanian Industrialists *[Vilnius Radio]* 77
- Lithuania's Prunskiene Addresses Baltic Issues *[Frankfurt FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU 14 Sep]* 77
- Shenin To Attend Lithuanian Party Congress *[Vilnius International]* 78
- Lithuanian Parliament Decries Criticism *[EKHO LITVY 14 Aug]* 78
- Lithuanian Deputies Continue To Draw USSR Pay *[PRAVDA 13 Sep]* 78
- Lithuanian Party Denies Seeking Revenge *[EKHO LITVY 14 Aug]* 79
- Lithuania To Set Up Customs, Restrict Exports *[PRAVDA 13 Sep]* 80
- New Lithuanian Trade Law Includes Heavy Fines *[Moscow Radio]* 80
- 11 Soldiers Killed in Lithuanian Truck Crash *[TASS]* 80
- Baltic Representatives on German Unification *[Frankfurt FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU 12 Sep]* 80
- Baltic Trade Ministers Sign Cooperation Pact *[Vilnius International]* 81

RSFSR

- RSFSR Parliament Postpones No-Confidence Vote *[IZVESTIYA 15 Sep]* 81
  - No-Confidence Bill Tabled 15 Sep *[Moscow Radio]* 81
- RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session 14 Sep Detailed 82
  - Freedom of Conscience Bill Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 82
  - 'History-Making' Bill Approved *[TASS]* 82
  - 'Differences' on Bill Bar Passage *[TASS]* 83
- Resolution on Stabilizing Economy Published *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Sep]* 83
- Yavlinskiy Answers Questions on Economic Plan *[IZVESTIYA 12 Sep]* 83
- RSFSR's Silayev Views Shatalin Program *[TASS]* 84
- Silayev Holds Press Conference 15 Sep *[Moscow TV]* 85
- RSFSR Supsov Issues Resolution on 1990 Harvest *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Sep]* 89
- RSFSR Fulfills 59 Percent of State Grain Order *[Moscow TV]* 89
- RSFSR Minister Interviewed on Grain Sales *[Moscow Radio]* 89
- Decree Extends Farmers' Right To Sell Produce *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Sep]* 90
- Oleynik Describes Multi-Party System *[TASS]* 90
- RSFSR CP Editorial Commission Members Listed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Sep]* 90
- Leningrad Mayor Tenders Resignation *[TASS]* 91
  - Sobchak Comments on Resignation *[Moscow TV]* 91
- New Leningrad Soviet Paper Seeks Editor *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Sep]* 91
- LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA Describes New Editor *[1 Sep]* 92
- City Party Abandons Approved Cadre Listing *[IZVESTIYA 5 Sep]* 93

- Moscow Soviet Fined Over Tobacco Price Hike *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Sep]* ... 93
- Moscow Discusses Proposal for Labor Exchange *[TASS]* ... 93
- Moscow Soviet To Consider City Management Plans *[IZVESTIYA 10 Sep]* ... 94
- Yaroslav Protests RSFSR Finance Ministry Act *[IZVESTIYA 13 Sep]* ... 94
- Tatar Deputy Discusses Sovereignty Declaration *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Sep]* ... 95
- Volgograd Rally Warns Against 'Terror' *[IZVESTIYA 11 Sep]* ... 95
- Vladimir Oblast Takes Privatization Steps *[IZVESTIYA 13 Sep]* ... 96
- Chechen-Ingush Ethnic Tension Reported ... 96
  - Refugees Flee to Groznyy *[Moscow International]* ... 96
  - 'Outsiders' Told To Leave *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Sep]* ... 96
- Vologda Police Expose Extortion Gang *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Sep]* ... 97
- Maritime Province Official Discusses Development *[Moscow International]* ... 97
- Komi Oil Concern To Work With Foreign Firms *[PRAVDA 9 Sep]* ... 98
- Leningrad Shipping Firm Transfers to Lease Status *[TASS]* ... 98
- Nakhodka Port Reconstruction Begins *[Moscow Radio]* ... 98
- Murmansk Sailors Strike for More Pay *[Moscow Radio]* ... 98
- Northwest Customs Department Established *[TASS]* ... 99
- Package Mail Into Moscow Suspended *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Sep]* ... 99
- Russian Radio, Television Plans Disclosed *[Moscow International]* ... 99

Western Republics

- British Observe Belorussia Military Exercise *[TASS]* ... 99
- Debates Continue on Gagauz, Dnestr Sovereignty ... 99
  - Snegur Addresses Rally *[Moscow TV]* ... 99
  - Gagauz Leader Arrested *[IZVESTIYA 17 Sep]* ... 100
  - Components Differ Over Draft *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Sep]* ... 100
  - Leaders Back Political Solution *[Moscow Radio]* ... 101
  - Soviet Debates Separatism *[IZVESTIYA 11 Sep]* ... 101
  - Gagauz 'Republic' Congress Held *[TASS]* ... 101
- Moldavian Communist Leader Urges Union Treaty *[Moscow International]* ... 102
- Kharkov Oblast Committee Elects New Secretary *[Moscow Radio]* ... 102
- Church Officials Discuss Conflict in Ukraine *[TASS]* ... 102

Caucasus

- Armenian State of Emergency Still in Effect ... 102
  - Ter-Petrosyan Cited on ANA *[MOSCOW NEWS No 36]* ... 102
  - Curfew Reduced Two Hours *[Moscow Radio]* ... 103
- Trade Union Council Ends Ties to CPSU *[Yerevan Radio]* ... 103
- Tension Continues on Armenia-Azerbaijan Border ... 103
  - TV Building Rocked by Bomb *[TASS]* ... 103
  - Catholicos Appeal to Gorbachev *[Moscow Radio]* ... 103
  - Azerbaijan Sends Protest Note *[TASS]* ... 103
  - Troops End Hunger Strike *[Yerevan Radio]* ... 104
  - Yerevan Reports on Incidents *[ARMENPRES]* ... 104
  - Extremists Attack Trucks, Buses *[Baku Radio]* ... 105
  - Deterioration in Situation Seen *[IZVESTIYA 17 Sep]* ... 105
- New 'Stalin' Group To Contest Georgian Elections *[Moscow Radio]* ... 105

Central Asia

- Kazakhstan Sovereignty Draft Declaration Reviewed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 105
- Nazarbayev Warns of 'Blind Nationalist Ambition' *[IZVESTIYA 13 Sep]* ... 106
- Ekibastuz Power Station Explosion Kills Three *[PRAVDA 14 Sep]* ... 106
- Tajik Supreme Soviet To Publish Newspaper *[Dushanbe Radio]* ... 106
- Conversion of Turkmen Fertilizer Plant Opposed *[Moscow TV]* ... 106

Nuclear Test Ban Urged, Research Defended

PM1409105990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by Prof. V. Mikhaylov, USSR deputy minister of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry, under the rubric "Competent Opinion": "Why the Country's Nuclear Test Sites Are Silent"]

[Text] The United States has carried out four nuclear explosions so far this year. France has also carried out four, and China has carried out two. At the same time our country's nuclear test sites have now been silent for approximately one year. An alarming situation. Is such a political risk justified in our time? Stability in the world is founded on approximate parity between the Soviet and U.S. nuclear arsenals. Our country's unilateral nuclear disarmament is a path to a U.S. monopoly. And any monopoly, particularly in such a sphere, is fraught with unpredictable consequences for the whole world community's political and economic relations.

Today the halting of all nuclear tests has assumed fundamental significance. The creation [sozdaniye] of third-generation nuclear weapons or so-called directed-energy weapons cannot be permitted. This evil "jinni" cannot be let out of the stage of scientific enquiry into the stage of full-scale development [razrabotka]. On the one hand, these weapons are to be 1,000 times less dangerous than existing ones in terms of global radioactive pollution, while on the other hand they are to be capable of hitting strategic enemy targets. It is precisely this that causes the alarm, since some excessively hot heads might be tempted to use them in any conflict.

More and more people in the world are supporting the demand for a nuclear test ban. At the same time there is very serious opposition from the West's nuclear powers. International discussions on this question are continuing more persistently today than ever. Within the framework of the new doctrine of defense sufficiency the Soviet Union has advocated and advocates now the immediate and total cessation of all nuclear tests. And it is not the Soviet Union's fault that nuclear tests are continuing. In 1985 we declared a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. In 1986 M.S. Gorbachev, our country's leader, put forward a program to create a nuclear-free world by the year 2000. However, our appeal was not heard in the United States, where 26 underground nuclear explosions were carried out during the period of the moratorium, including some for the purposes of creating third-generation weapons and weapons based on new physical principles.

In all 714 nuclear explosions have been carried out in the Soviet Union, including 499 underground blasts since the conclusion of the 1963 Moscow treaty. According to data in open publications, as checked by our national technical means of verification, in all approximately 1,080 nuclear explosions have been carried out to date in the United States, including approximately 750 underground blasts since 1963. France has carried out 180 explosions, Britain 42, and China 34.

Our country has two nuclear test sites—Semipalatinsk, set up in 1948, and the Northern site in Novaya Zemlya, established in 1954. In Kazakhstan 467 nuclear explosions have been carried out, including 343 underground blasts since 1963. On the Northern site—131 nuclear explosions, including 41 underground blasts.

Since 1963, 115 underground nuclear explosions have been carried out in various parts of the country for peaceful purposes at comparatively great depth and with a low yield, including explosions for purposes of creating underground capacities, extinguishing fyres on gas blowouts, intensifying oil extraction, and sounding out the earth's crust on our territory in the large-scale search for minerals.

Does the Soviet Union need two nuclear test sites today? Taking the positive trends in the world into account, I think not. The country's Supreme Soviet must have its say on the periods for which the nuclear test sites are to function, on the principles of compensation for the degree of risk to people living in these areas and for the loss of access to the land used for test sites, with due regard for the geographic position and the geological structure of the sites' territory and the density of population in adjacent regions. However, the resolution of this important question is taking a long time, and perplexity and confusion are leading this problem into an impasse. I believe that it is necessary, first of all, to end nuclear weapon tests at the Semipalatinsk site.

Decisions on the country's annual nuclear programs, including nuclear tests, have to be adopted by a special commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions and approved by the USSR president.

Our test sites have again been silent since October 1989, while the site in the state of Nevada is continuing to function. It is true that the intensity has diminished somewhat, but it remains, I would say, at quite a high level. In practice, over the past five years our test sites have been silent for half the time.

Peremptory statements by public figures on radio and television, in the press, and from Supreme Soviet rostrums, and rallies and meetings of informal public organizations demanding a halt to nuclear tests are creating a public opinion in our country in favor of further unilateral steps.

There is no doubt that the majority of their authors have very sincere intentions to save mankind from nuclear disaster. However, in our country the center of gravity of the struggle for universal nuclear disarmament has shifted sharply in recent years toward virtually unilateral nuclear disarmament. Can our country afford to become a hostage to other nuclear powers' political ambitions? Because nuclear weapons today, if you consider the consequences of their use, are above all weapons of global politics. The voice of the professionals is being stifled by the chorus of public commentators on a sphere in which competence and caution are particularly important.

Under these conditions the fact that the population is unprepared to perceive objectively information about the nature and the special features of the radioactive and seismic situation, and is uninformed about measures to ensure safety, and the difficult social and domestic living conditions frequently lead to an emotional inflaming of passions over the country's nuclear test sites. It should be pointed out in this connection that Soviet specialists ensure the safety of underground nuclear explosions to a standard not inferior to the U.S. standard and, as for the cost of carrying them out, this is one-tenth of what it is in the United States. And this cost makes up an insignificant proportion of the expenditure on nuclear arms. A situation has been created in our country in which any expression of criticism of the Soviet test sites is considered patriotic and progressive. And, as always in such instances, a number of public figures use it to enhance their popularity, frequently appearing also in the role of stage managers of mass demonstrations.

At the same time the United States and its NATO allies are continuing to improve their nuclear arsenal. A long-term program to modernize installations connected with the development and production of nuclear weapons is being examined. New, more sophisticated ways of managing this complex are being created. The safety, reliability, and efficiency of nuclear weapons over the next 20 years occupy a special place in the long-term program. Enhancing the safety of nuclear weapons in accident situations or in the event of unsanctioned access is regarded as one of the chief requirements in improving nuclear weapons, bearing in mind that they contain radioactive materials such as plutonium, uranium, and tritium. Underground nuclear weapon tests today represent the highest-priority experimental program of research and engineering work to improve nuclear weapons and create new types. Intensive work is being done to increase the targeting accuracy of nuclear-tipped warheads and to create weapons with enhanced survivability under conditions of defense against missiles and space weapons and for hitting targets buried deep underground. And these are first-strike weapons, you know! And this at a time when the NATO countries, unlike our country, have not adopted any pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Can the country's nuclear test sites stay silent under these conditions? In order to give the correct answer to this question, it is necessary to replace rhetoric, rallies, and meetings with the art of sober assessment.

We are all seeking to instill order in our own home, but not everything is turning out right here yet. There are many examples of this at every step. Our home is not alone on the planet, because we all live in a complex and dynamic world. In the age of nuclear and space technology, time and space in this world have been compressed to the utmost for each home.

There are still many parts of the world with an unstable political situation and extreme, aggressive sentiments, including some right on our borders. Certain "third countries" are working intensively on the creation of nuclear weapons. So the nuclear potential created at a difficult time for the country and its constant maintenance at a modern scientific and technical level are a guarantee of stable peace on our planet and, I would say, a guarantee of the success of the new thinking in talks on equal terms on the mutual limitation and ending of nuclear tests. It is a matter not of the number of missiles with nuclear warheads but of the country's scientific and technical potential which can make a flexible response to other countries' possible achievements in this sphere. It is considerably more difficult to prevent the degradation of unique collectives of highly qualified professionals than to destroy everything. But today, frankly speaking, workers, engineers, and scientists need civic courage in order to preserve high responsibility and patriotism and not yield to the temptation of instant advantage, in the name of preserving our Union as a great community. I am convinced that our people will understand this.

Soviet Envoy Assails Iraq at UN Session

LD1609140890 Moscow TASS in English 1350 GMT 16 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Maslov]

[Text] United Nations September 16 TASS—The crisis caused by the occupation and then annexation of Kuwait by Iraq rivets the attention of the U.N. Security Council which persistently seeks to resolve it through political and diplomatic channels, Soviet permanent representative at the U.N. Yuliy Vorontsov said on behalf of the Soviet Union at the U.N. Security Council.

Incidentally, Vorontsov is president of the U.N. Security Council for September.

The international community insists that Iraq should observe its obligations under the U.N. charter, relevant Security Council resolutions which it should fulfil as a member of the United Nations organisation, as well as other international legal documents signed by Iraq, Vorontsov continued.

"Meanwhile, reports from the Gulf region continue provoking concern and anxiety among us," he noted.

The latest actions by Iraqi authorities with respect to the embassy personnel of France and other states in Kuwait show that Iraq continues ignoring the will of the international community, refusing to stop illegal actions against diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait.

These actions are a flagrant violation of the basic principles and norms of relations between civilised states and provisions of Security Council resolution 664, under which Iraq is obliged not to raise any obstacles in the operation of diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait.

The dignity and interests of states demand that their diplomatic representatives are treated with respect.

Any wrongdoing against diplomatic missions and their staff, the more so the deprivation of their immunity and a possibility to implement their duties, is and was from times immemorial an encroachment on the honour and sovereign rights of states which these diplomats represent.

The Soviet Union supports the provisions of the present resolution, sharing indignation at Iraq's latest actions. "We expect that the Iraqi Government will heed, at long last, to Security Council demands, the main of which is an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Iraqi troops from Kuwait in order to restore the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of that state."

Iraq should understand that the Security Council sternly warns Iraq by the present resolution that a refusal to fulfil the charter will result in the council taking additional measures aimed at unconditional implementation of its resolutions which reflect the will of the international community.

The international community resolutely declares that aggression cannot and will not pay.

The Soviet Union and other countries hope that common sense and responsibility will take the upper hand in Iraq and the present crisis will be resolved, Vorontsov concluded.

Soviet, UK Commanders Meet in Germany

PM1409152090 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[Unnamed "our correspondent" report: "On a Return Visit"]

[Text] Army General B. Snetkov, commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces, had a meeting in Rheindahlen (FRG) 12 September with Gen. P. Inge, commander in chief of the British Army of the Rhine, and Air Marshal R. Palin, commander in chief of the Royal Air Force in Germany. Army Gen. B. Snetkov arrived at the Joint Staff of the British Forces in Germany at the invitation of the British commanders in chief on a return visit within the framework of a plan of contacts between the Western Group of Forces and the British Forces in Germany.

During the two-day visit the commanders in chief exchanged opinions on questions of mutual interest. The Soviet side emphasized the need to maintain the military liaison missions accredited to the commanders in chief during the transitional period associated with the unification of Germany.

The commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces and the generals and officers accompanying him visited Brueggen airbase, the artillery regiment at Guetersloh, and Sennelager training center, where they familiarized themselves with the life and daily routine of British servicemen and with the organization of combat training in units and subunits. Individual models of weapons and military hardware of the British Forces in Germany were shown, and their combat potential was demonstrated.

Genscher, De Maiziere Address Ministers

PM1409115190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

["Letter to Four Powers' Foreign Ministers from GDR and FRG Governments"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Concerning today's signing of the treaty on a final settlement regarding Germany we would like to notify you that the Governments of the FRG and the GDR covered the following during their talks:

1. The 15 June 1990 joint statement of the FRG and GDR Governments on the settlement of unresolved property issues contains inter alia the following provisions:

"Measures to confiscate property taken on the basis of the rights and supremacy of the occupying powers (1945-1949) are irreversible. The Governments of the Soviet Union and the GDR see no possibility of reviewing the steps taken at the time. The FRG Government, considering historical development, takes this into account. It believes that the future all-German parliament should be allowed to take the final decision on possible state compensation measures."

In accordance with the provisions of Point 1, Article 41 of the 31 August 1990 treaty between the FRG and the GDR on the building of German unity (Treaty on Unification) this joint statement is a component of this treaty. In accordance with Point 3 Article 41 of the Treaty on Unification the FRG will not issue normative actions contradicting the part of the joint statement cited above.

2. The monuments erected on German soil to the victims of war and tyranny will be respected and under the protection of German laws. The same applies to military burial grounds which will be preserved and tended.

3. The preservation of the basic principles of a free and democratic system is also protected by the constitution in a united Germany. It is the foundation for ensuring that parties which, to judge by their aims or the conduct of their supporters, seek to infringe upon or do away with the foundations of a free and democratic system and organizations whose activity is directed against constitutional procedure or the idea of the peoples' mutual understanding may be banned. That also applies to parties and organizations with national-socialist aims.

With regard to the treaties concluded by the GDR, Points 1 and 2 of Article 12 of the 31 August 1990 treaty between the FRG and the GDR on building German unity agree on the following:

"The contracting sides agree that the treaties in international law concluded by the GDR during the building of German unity should be examined with the GDR's partners in the treaties from the viewpoint of protecting the trust and interests of the participating states and the treaty commitments of the FRG and also in accordance with the principles of a free democratic and rule-of-law state structure and with a consideration for the competence of the EC in order to settle or determine the continued operation, adaptation, or cessation of these treaties.

The united Germany will determine its position on the transfer of the GDR's treaties in international law after consultations with the relevant partners in the treaties and with the EC inasmuch as it affects their competence."

Accept our very high respect

[Signed] Lothar de Maiziere, Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

German Settlement News Conference Reported

PM1409131390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by B. Lysenko: "Document Directed into the Future"]

[Excerpts] The date 12 September 1990 will go down in history as an important milestone on the path of postwar Europe's further development. On that day the foreign ministers of six states—the USSR, the United State, Britain, France, the GDR, and the FRG—in the presence of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev signed the treaty on the final settlement regarding Germany which contains decisions on the whole complex of external aspects of German unity.

Immediately after the signing of this notable document the ministers of the "six" held a press conference. USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze issued a statement. [passage omitted]

The other participants in the meeting also addressed journalists. Each gave his own assessment of the treaty and the results of the seven months of joint work. [passage omitted]

D. Hurd: It is right that the agreement finally settling all external aspects of German unity should have been signed in Moscow. The Soviet policy of "new thinking" "was the key" to the solution of this problem. We should note the efforts made in this direction by President Gorbachev.

R. Dumas: Today we have drawn a line through one of the most abnormal and intolerable situations inherited from World War II. This has become possible thanks to changes which have taken place in East Europe and above all in the USSR. The time has now come to strengthen friendship and cooperation in all fields between all peoples of Europe so that they can all take a full part in the continent's advance toward a confederation.

Then the journalists asked all the minister many questions. They concerned Near East problems and relations between East and West and aspects of the disarmament talks but nonetheless most attention was paid to the treaty. A large part of the questions were addressed to E.A. Shevardnadze and H.-D. Genscher. Some of them were formulated very sharply.

Thus our minister was asked: "In assessing the USSR's policy with regard to Germany some people used to say that the USSR was selling off East Europe. Do you not believe that during the debates on the ratification of this treaty in the Soviet parliament you will come up against this position?" E.A. Shevardnadze replied: "When we take responsible, serious political decisions and define our fundamental relations with states, including neighboring states, I think we should not be guided by any narrow-minded thoughts and narrow-minded approaches. You know the principles of the new political thinking. They were at the basis of the Soviet Union's foreign policy. We were also guided by these principles in determining the positions for Germany's unification."

Answering a question, FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher said that the process of unification is not only a matter for the state, it is something which affects each citizen individually. We know that in accomplishing the process of German unification we are not yet creating a united Europe. And we will now direct all our efforts toward making our contribution to the creation of such a Europe and toward ensuring that this Europe is not only responsible for itself but also responsible everywhere in the world for safeguarding peace, for economic development and social justice, for the defense of the natural foundations of life.

A few days ago Gorbachev and Bush met in Helsinki. They were faced with a unique challenge which was issued to the world community by an aggressor. The overcoming of the contradictions between East and West, the overcoming of the split enabled us to jointly oppose the aggressor. What is now happening in the world and what has now arisen in relations between East and West and is continuing to develop is not only a gain for the States of North America and Europe, it is a gain for everyone who wants to safeguard peace throughout the world.

"Is it not disappointing that foreign troops will remain in Berlin and will that not be an obstacle to moving the capital of a united Germany to Berlin?" was the question put to H.-D. Genscher. He replied that the troops of the United States, France, Britain, and the USSR will be able to stay within the size limits in which they are already present in the city while Soviet troops are stationed on the territory of the neighboring GDR. We believe that it is a good thing that these troops will remain in the city and will maintain contacts with the Bundeswehr. And where the capital will be the future will tell.

The new treaty replaces the rights and responsibility of the four powers. This will happen from the moment the treaty enters into force, after its ratification. The treaty on the final settlement in international law of external aspects of German unity will be submitted at the meeting of the heads of state and government of the countries taking part in the CSCE.

Warsaw Pact's Lobov Receives NATO Delegation

PM1409134790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Sep 90 Second Edition p 3

[Major M. Pogorelyy report: "Meeting at Defense Ministry"]

[Text] Army General V.N. Lobov, chief of staff of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces, had a meeting at the USSR Ministry of Defense 12 September with a delegation of the ATA [Atlantic Treaty Association] which is in our country at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation.

ATA President B. Gomes, leader of the delegation, spoke about this organization's tasks and the purpose of the first visit in history by its representatives to the Soviet Union.

Army General V.N. Lobov in turn briefed the ATA delegation members on the firm conviction expressed by the Union republics' representatives when preparing the new Union Treaty that strong, unified Armed Forces manned according to the extraterritorial principle are needed to ensure the defense of the USSR (or the Union of Soviet States).

At the meeting U. Bayulken, president of the Turkish National Atlantic Association and former foreign minister of his country, also aired the interesting idea of forming in the long term a "superalliance" of states of both blocs within the framework of a European system of collective security—to ensure peace on our continent.

The situation in the Persian Gulf region did not escape attention either. Army General V.N. Lobov urged the delegation members, who are very authoritative figures in the NATO countries, to help shape a public opinion censorious of aggression. This, so he believes, could be a no less effective means of preventing war in that region than economic sanctions or armed opposition.

The Soviet side also briefed the guests on the practical steps being taken by our state's leadership in the matter of reducing the strength and the arms of the USSR Armed Forces. Thus, today approximately 70 percent of the servicemen subject to reduction have already been discharged, and approximately 60 percent of the troops that were in Hungary and Czechoslovakia have been withdrawn from there.

Warsaw Pact, NATO Officials Begin Talks

LD1409130590 Moscow TASS in English 1241 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Valdimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna September 14 TASS—Warsaw Pact and NATO officials began consultations in Vienna today on a declaration on relations between the two blocs' member-countries.

The first round of consultations was held at the Soviet Embassy in Vienna. The Soviet delegation presented its draft declaration.

The head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Department for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Yuriy Deryabin, told TASS that the new document should "seal the new quality of relations between the two military and political blocs.

"Moreover, reflecting the transformation of the alliances and the shift of the emphasis from the military sphere onto the political one, the declaration should become an important step towards the renunciation of bloc approaches and stereotypes and mark a major stage in forming all-European, supra-bloc structures for security and cooperation."

Deryabin expressed conviction that the "focal point of the future declaration should be a provision saying that Warsaw Pact and NATO countries no longer regard one another as adversaries, but favour comprehensive close multilateral cooperation on a qualitatively new basis, further progress in disarmament, the expansion of contacts in all areas, including military and civilian, and the creation of security structures in Europe.

"If the consultations prove successful, the declaration could be signed during a European summit conference. Its all-European context could be confirmed in a final document of the summit meeting of 35 countries of Europe, the United States and Canada," Deryabin said.

Shevardnadze To Address United Nations

LD1409115690 Moscow TASS in English 1128 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze will address the 45th session of the United Nations General Assembly on September 25, Shevardnadze's Deputy Vladimir Petrovskiy told a briefing here today.

He said Shevardnadze would attend a meeting of the foreign ministers of 35 countries participating in the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe, to be held in New York on October 1-2.

The foreign minister plans to have about 40 meetings with the heads of delegations from various countries and representatives of some regional groups. He will also have talks with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker.

Petrovskiy said the Soviet delegation to the General Assembly session would "aim to preserve all positive tendencies in the world and develop global cooperation".

TASS Reports Gerasimov's 14 Sep Briefing

Views Status of Iraqi Students

LD1409154390 Moscow TASS in English 1531 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Leonid Timofeyev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—Until recently, nearly 800 Iraqis studied at Soviet higher educational establishments, technical schools or post-graduate courses, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

Following a crisis in the Gulf, some of them left the Soviet Union, and no one arrived in the USSR for the new academic year. Asked about the presence of Iraqi cadets at military training establishments, Gerasimov stressed that their number is insignificant, several dozen, and their contracts and agreements expire in December.

Reviews Baker-Shevardnadze Talks

LD1409160490 Moscow TASS in English 1552 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—"Soviet-American relations continue to improve. They are increasingly characterised by the spirit of cooperation and partnership," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today, summing up the results of the talks in Moscow between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James A. Baker.

During the talks, he noted, the sides discussed specific measures to work out an offensive weapons reduction treaty. The Soviet and American officials agreed that there existed an actual possibility to prepare the treaty for signing as scheduled.

The two foreign ministers agreed to stimulate the search for mutually acceptable solutions to problems of limiting conventional arms in Europe, as well as of confidence- and security-building measures on the continent with the aim of reaching an agreement on these matters by November—the time of the CSCE summit.

On the preparations for the CSCE member-countries' Paris summit, Gerasimov said that the sides had arrived at the conclusion that there existed the possibility of coming up with major accords in Paris, capable of advancing the Helsinki process along all lines.

The ministers agreed to begin, as soon as possible, work on the text of a declaration by the NATO and Warsaw Pact member-countries.

Such a document, Gerasimov said, may contribute to the creation of a new situation in Europe.

Participants in the talks, the Soviet spokesman said, did not differ over the urgent need for reinforced efforts to conclude international agreements and conventions to prevent the proliferation of chemical and nuclear weapons, missiles and missile technologies and to restrict arms trade.

Regional and economic problems were also discussed during the talks between Baker and Shevardnadze. The sides expressed the mutual desire to perfect the treaty-and-legal basis for the development of Soviet-American economic relations.

The Soviet and American foreign ministers discussed conditions for holding the next Soviet-U.S. summit. It was noted that proposals and ideas contained in the Soviet memorandum on Soviet-American cooperation might provide a basis for working out new accords both in the field of bilateral relations and in the transnational field.

Experts of the two countries will soon begin specific work to prepare intergovernmental documents for signing during the next summit, Gerasimov told Soviet and foreign journalists during the briefing.

Discusses Arms Conference

LD1409160990 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—The Soviet Union is convinced that the 4th conference on nuclear non-proliferation treaty, which ends in Geneva today, will succeed in finding the necessary compromise solutions to contentious issues, and pave the way for preserving and strengthening the largest and most authoritative multilateral treaty. This statement was made by Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov at a news briefing in Moscow today.

He said that a lot of work is under way at the conference to coordinate the provisions of the final document. Although consensus wordings have been elaborated on the majority of contentious issues, some of them still remain in "brackets". The delegations work intensively on a final declaration that would be aimed at further strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime and extending it to 1995.

Gerasimov recalled that the Albanian ambassador handed over to the Soviet ambassador in Sofia two days ago an official text of the decision of the Albanian people's assembly to join the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, of July 1, 1968. The Soviet Union welcomes this step, Gerasimov said, noting that the treaty now covered 142 states.

Previews Italian Minister's Visit

LD1409165190 Moscow TASS in English 1645 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—Italian Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis arrives on a working visit to the Soviet Union today, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here.

This visit, he said, attests to further expansion of Soviet-Italian dialogue. During the upcoming talks, aspects of bilateral relations will be discussed. They will include Italian assistance to social and economic reforms in the USSR and its transition to a market-based system.

The sides will undoubtedly focus on the Persian Gulf crisis and the preparation for the Paris CSCE summit.

"We consider our relations with Italy a major factor of deepening constructive dialogue with Western Europe, while understanding that Italy now chairs the European Economic Community," the Soviet spokesman said.

The Italian foreign minister is expected to hold a news conference here on Saturday. Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze is believed likely to take part in this news conference.

Reports on Chernobyl Shelter

LD1409170590 Moscow TASS in English 1657 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—In connection with reports that appeared recently in foreign mass media about the allegedly unsatisfactory condition of the shelter facility at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov made public the following information of the Soviet Ministry of Nuclear Power Engineering.

The shelter facility was built at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant in 1986 in order to prevent the leakage into the environment of radioactive substance from the damaged reactor and to protect the nearby territory from penetrating irradiation. The facility was made of metal structures. The remaining parts of the building of power unit No. 4 were used as supports for them. According to the USSR State Committee for Construction, the facility's service life will be 30 years.

The building structures are being kept under continuous observation. All changes in their state are being registered by an automated control system. The settings and inclinations of the structure do not exceed acceptable norms. There were no changes in the position of the structure and the destroyed reactor as a result of the earthquake of May 30 and 31, this year.

According to the Ministry of Nuclear Power Engineering, at present scientists and engineers are working out ways of a final burial of the damaged power unit.

'Observers Roundtable' Views Week's Events 16 Sep

LD1609172990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1136 GMT 16 Sep 90

["International Observers at the Roundtable" program with "its chairman" Boris Andrianov and All-Union Radio foreign affairs commentators Nikolay Agayants and Gennadiy Vedenyapin]

[Excerpts] [Andrianov] Hello, Comrades. We begin our traditional Sunday broadcast, International Observers at the Roundtable. At the microphone is its chairman Boris Andrianov. I have with me the All-Union Radio foreign affairs commentators Nikolay Agayants and Gennadiy Vedenyapin.

Exactly a week ago today, the Soviet-American summit was held in Helsinki. Though officially described as a working meeting, the talks between the presidents of the Soviet Union and the United States, their joint statements, and the news conference given by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Bush were seen as enormous events of world importance.

[Agayants] Yes, a week has passed, but this event is still the focus of attention for the world public and the media. The assessments, viewpoints, and interpretations of what has taken place diverge like circles on water. Although they differ both in sense and in tone—which is, I may say, natural—all these opinions can be reduced to a common denominator: the fact that the meeting between Bush and Gorbachev was exceedingly necessary at this stage, and important. After all, the Soviet-American summit talks in Helsinki, though they lasted only one day, contained so much that was new and unusual that to call them vestibular [prokhodnoy], as some observer did on the eve of the meeting, is out of the question.

[Andrianov] Certainly. These talks have not only taken their full place in the series of meetings between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, going back to that of November 1985 in Geneva, but have also opened a new page in the history both of bilateral Soviet-American relations and in the buildng of a world system on the principles of the new political thinking. [passage omitted]

[Andrianov] In speaking about the events of the past week, we cannot possibly overlook that which took place in our capital on 12 September. After a difficult marathon, the foreign ministers of six states—the USSR, United States, Great Britain, France, the GDR and the FRG—at last signed the treaty on the final settlement of Germany. [passage omitted]

Now the very term victorious powers is also becoming part of history.

[Agayants] But, you know, one should still draw attention to the fact that—and this was not to be avoided—certain results of World War II have been enshrined quite specifically in the treaty. I have in the mind the borders of the united Germany, its renunciation now and subsequently of all territorial claims. Not so long ago Chancellor Kohl himself was giving assurances the border question was the prerogative of the new united Germany. Subsequently, however, Bonn was obliged to give a guarantee on this. As you see, this is one of the sensible compromises without which the signing of the treaty would have been inconceivable. Experience shows that in today's world it is impossible to survive without concessions of this kind.

[Vedenyapin] It is quite obvious that all participants in the talks made a contribution to reaching agreement. To give credit where it is due, they displayed a constructive approach, readiness to compromise and determination to seek mutually acceptable solutions. I think however, the changes in East Europe, perestroyka in our country and, finally, our leadership's new political thinking were of course the main and fundamental prerequisite that opened the way to the successful completion of the extremely complicated process of unification. Virtually everyone is agreed on this. After all, one should not forget the Soviet Union suffered more than anyone during World War II and one might think it would be less interested than the rest in changing the post-war set-up. It was not in vain that Douglas Hurd, the British foreign secretary, noted: It is right that an agreement that settles all the external aspects of German unity once and for all should be signed precisely in Moscow. According to Douglas Hurd, it was our policy of new thinking that provided the key to resolving this complex problem.

[Andrianov] Incidentally, exactly the same can be said about the changes in our position on a German settlement. After all, as you will recall, just four months ago we were against the united Germany joining NATO. This, basically, was the main obstacle to agreement. In passing I will note both here and abroad most people realized this approach was motivated not simply by stubborness, capriciousness, or another attempt to demonstrate great power status.

This approach was based on our bitter historical experience. However, after weighing all the pros and cons and considering the fact that the North Atlantic Alliance was displaying a wish for change, that the Warsaw Pact organization and NATO no longer regard each other as adversaries, and are prepared to renounce force or the threat of its use, we agreed to give the united Germany trust on credit.

[Agayants] Not everyone may be happy with this outcome. Let us just think for a moment. What would happen if the Soviet Union were to resist the new process with all its might and main? There were quite a few people who said we should exercise our rights as an occupying power, that we should bang our fist on the table, so to speak, and so on, and so forth. Many demanded we should on no account withdraw from East Germany. If we did, then we would find NATO right on our doorstep, the argument ran. Personally, I regard such arguments as a kind of relapse into the well-known attitudes of the post-war epoch. In my view, something still more dangerous is to be seen here. This is the aspiration to retain the siege mentality, if I may put it that way, as a justification for possible screw-tightening within our country.

[Andrianov] It was not in vain that, in summing up the results of seven months of strenuous work leading up to the signing of the treaty, our foreign minister, Comrade Shevardnadze, stressed: I think we have managed to obtain all the guarantees and undertakings we needed from the united Germany, ones which correspond to the real conditions, the real situation in Europe.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, as you see, our idea of a neutral Germany turned out to be unrealizable—in the present, concrete historical conditions at least—even though it was a very attractive prospect indeed. Nevertheless, we should pay attention to the fact that the strength of the armed forces of the future united Germany will not be great by world standards: 370,000 men. There is also one other important point that should not be overlooked. That is Germany's renunciation of the manufacture, possession, and control over weapons of mass destruction, and, of course, the fact that the undertakings given by both the GDR and the FRG, that war will never again emanate from German soil, have been formally recorded. All these points have been clearly articulated in the treaty on the final settlement with respect to Germany.

[Agayants] If we ask ourselves how perfect the results of the two-plus-four talks are, we could naturally find certain flaws when they are viewed from our point of view. Of course, many people—and not just those in the Soviet Union—would be happier if the future Germany were to be a neutral, nuclear-free zone in the center of our continent. Life itself shows it is virtually impossible to impose neutrality, on its own. The example of Austria showed it is only possible when the people of a given country make it clear that they want this. Clearly it will be a sign of the maturity of the German people of they understood that in future they should keep as far away as possible from any kind of nuclear ambition.

[Vedenyapin] Well, one can safely say we for our part have displayed political maturity. We have already discussed the policy of new political thinking which, basically, has become a key to open the way not only to the unification of the two German states, but also to create a new system of interrelations of the European nations. This gives evidence of our good will and of considerable political courage. This is evidence of the will to reject old stereotypes for the sake of building the common European home.

So, we have a right to expect the future united Germany and the West, as a whole, not just recognize our contribution, but also undertake concrete actions, measures to resolve the still existing consequences of the Cold War which is, thank God, fading into the past, and develop achieved results.

[Andrianov] I would just like to add a few words to the issue of what danger is the future Germany to Europe. Let us ask ourselves, what could inspire Germany to a new drang nach osten [eastward expansion]? If we recall the thirties then this was justified by propaganda about the wish to raise the standard of living for its citizens, to liquidate unemployment, and to overcome a crisis. Yet, today, such motives can hardly be of any practical use. Now businessmen understand that to find new markets one must use completely different methods, especially as a united European market is strengtening its position with completely different rules governing it.

[Agayants] By the way, one of the documents of the British Foreign Office, related to, if I am not mistaken, 1953, stated precisely the following: Germany is the key to peace in Europe. Divided Europe means divided Germany. If we change the ideas vice versa, we come to the conclusion that if now the division of Germany is overcome it means it is Europe's turn next, which is at present still divided into blocs.

[Vedenyapin] In any case, Nikolay Ivanovich, with the unification of Germany common European cooperation, which is difficult to dispute, indisputably gets an unprecedented opportunity. It is evident the division of Europe on the bloc basis is gradually disappearing into the past. There is optimistic evidence the construction of the European house is not a dream, not something unrealistic. The process of its construction will not be an easy one, but it is quite possible. I would like to hope that all the European states, including the united Germany, will be striving for the successful accomplishment of this admittedly not easy process.

[Andrianov] The issue of uniting Germany has been in principle resolved. This has been clearly proved by the events of this week that is ending. Yet there are still quite a few outstanding problems in the world that are waiting to be resolved. I would even say they are not only waiting, but are demanding their solution as quick as possible, because this is in the interest of the normalization of the whole situation in the world. [passage omitted]

'International Situation' Program Aired 14 Sep

LD1409170190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 14 Sep 90

["International Situation—Questions and Answers: with TASS Political Observer Yuriy Vladimirovich Ustimenko; moderator Sergey Pravdin, Radio Moscow foreign political commentator; and Igor Surguchev and Konstantin Patsyuk, Pravdin's "Colleagues"]

[Excerpts] [Pravdin] Hello, esteemed comrades. Five days have passed since the meeting between the presidents of the Soviet Union and the United States, but the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting which took place in Helsinki continues to be one of the most important international topics today.

We received many letters from our listeners in recent days asking us to tell them about the main results of the talks in the Finnish capital and the prospects for the further development of Soviet-U.S. relations.

We have been asked about this by Vasiliy Sergeyevich (Kochugov), from Gomel; Ivan Timofeyevich (Rozhin), from Nizhniy Novgorod; the (Shchagin) family, from the town of Venev, Tula oblast; Comrade (Krasin), from Omsk; (Shalyanin), from Moscow; (Petrenko), from Krasnoyarsk; (Semenchuk), from Vladivostok; Nina Ivanovna (Kochenko), from Sverdlovsk; and many others.

In our studio today is TASS Political Observer Yuriy Vladimirovich Ustimenko, and the first question from a listener to our guest is this:

How were the results of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Helsinki received in the United States itself?

[Ustimenko] President Bush, Secretary of State Baker, and other high-level representatives of the administration gave a high assessment of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit. Also important is the fact that leading representatives of the Republican and Democratic Parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress gave the same assessment, as did influential international affairs specialists, the press, and television. Judging by the latest public opinion polls, the actions being undertaken by the Bush administration regarding the conflict in the Persian Gulf region meet with the approval of the overwhelming majority of U.S. citizens, too. According to a WASHINGTON POST poll, more than 80 percent of Americans support the White House's present course.

Commenting on the results of the meeting in Helsinki, Americans are noting, first of all, the increased cooperation between the two great powers in the search for a settlement of the conflict in the Persian Gulf region. At the same time, they are stressing that the Helsinki meeting displayed the resolution of the United States and the Soviet Union to strengthen cooperation as a whole in the name of the peaceful solution of regional disputes. In this regard, American observers recall that not so long ago Washington's attitude to any actions by the USSR in the foreign policy arena was one of great suspicion. Moreover, they saw the hand of Moscow too frequently if and when a conflict flared up somewhere. But now, for virtually the first time in many decades, the two great powers are undertaking joint and energetic efforts in the name of a peaceful settlement.

[Pravdin] But even now the reaction in the United States has not been uniform.

[Ustimenko] Of course. I was getting to that.

Some U.S. legislators and press organs, commenting upon the results of the latest Soviet-American summit talks, have stressed the different interpretations and disagreements between the two great powers, thereby leading their readers to the idea that it is at the least premature to speak of cooperation between the United States and the USSR on settling regional conflicts. In this regard, they have mentioned the Soviet military advisers in Iraq, whose presence, to put it mildly, doesn't cause great enthusiasm among Americans. They have noticed, of course, that President Gorbachev stressed the need for diplomatic efforts to resolve the crisis, while President Bush has not excluded other means, including the use of force of arms.

[Pravdin] That means there are differences, after all.

[Ustimenko] But how could it be otherwise? Each of the great powers has its own interests, its own particular policies, and its obligations to third countries. They cannot be forgotten, and strict account should be taken of them in working out any common position.

I think something else is important here: the degree of understanding, cooperation, and readiness for joint actions that was expressed in Helsinki. I think it appropriate here to quote an extract from a NEW YORK TIMES article published at the end of the meeting. The paper wrote: It is possible that some people will be tempted to attach too much significance to the differences which remain between Washington and Moscow. However, they fade in comparison with the remarkable unanimity that the two leaders have now attained. At no time since 1945 have the United States and the Soviet Union had such close positions on a regional dispute, and at no time since the first days of the cold war has an U.S. president displayed readiness to grant economic assistance to the Soviet Union.

[Pravdin] The press is stressing that the participants in the Helsinki meeting also went further and didn't limit themselves to a discussion of the situation in the Persian Gulf region. Is this so?

[Ustimenko] Indeed. The significance of this meeting goes beyond the context of a discussion on the problem of one regional conflict. The presidents of the two great powers considered a wide range of issues, including those touching upon Soviet-U.S. relations and the prospects for their development.

The White House chief stressed once again his support for the process of deep reforms taking place in the Soviet Union, and he made it clear that he was prepared to move on from words to deeds. Whereas previously he spoke exclusively about providing technical assistance to the USSR, the question was put on a wider level this time, which has given the American press grounds to write about the possibility of granting the USSR economic and financial assistance. Of course, those American figures who are opposed to the deepening of links and contacts between our countries and who have built their careers upon anti-Sovietism immediately began to suggest U.S. assistance was something like a payment for Moscow's participation in joint efforts to settle the crisis in the Persian Gulf region.

I think the answer to such fabrications was given during the joint news conference in Helsinki, and it is clear that our position on international problems is not for sale and is not being sought.

[Pravdin] Can we assume that after Helsinki prospects are opening for cooperation between the two countries in other areas, too?

[Ustimenko] Absolutely. The United States has finally, after decades, agreed to recognize the Soviet Union's role and significance in a Near Eastern settlement. As the NEW YORK TIMES, which I have already mentioned, notes, with reference to official U.S. spokesmen, President Bush has renounced the age-old White House position which previously obstructed in every way possible the USSR's participation in efforts for a peaceful settlement in the Near East. The paper says Washington has expressed its readiness to consider the possibility of joint actions with Moscow on resolving the problems between the Arab states and Israel. The United States has also opened to the idea of a peace conference on the Near East, an idea the Soviet Union has been supporting for many years.

It's true that there has to be a proviso and that the United States is making a prior solution of the crisis in the Persian Gulf region a proviso for cooperation in a Near Eastern settlement.

[Pravdin] More briefly, the Americans are putting their own conditions to us.

[Ustimenko] Not at all. It's just that a reasonable compromise is being worked out.

On some issues, we are making concessions, and on others, the United States authorities are making them. You will agree that it is impossible to reach agreement without mutual concessions.

You will recall that in the past the inflexibility of each side obstructed progress in general on tackling acute world problems. But now, as far as I can judge, a situation has been created that is radically different from the previous one.

When did the United States and the USSR ever seek a common approach to the resolution of any issue? When did the heads of the two great powers ever stress the unity of their views?

[Pravdin] But, you see, there will probably be people who might accuse us of cooperating with imperialism?

[Ustimenko] Of course there will be, but I think that such people have complete forgotten about the unity and inseparability of the world in which we all live. Such people have simply fallen behind the times and are thinking according to the categories of the past, not the present.

I am firmly convinced that, separately, we and the United States are capable of causing a lot of misfortunes, but together, through our united efforts, we can and must make the world more safe for our generation and for new generations.

I have visited America more than once. I worked there for some years as a TASS correspondent, and I met many like-minded people, masses of people for whom peace on earth is just as important as it is for us. And it is on such a basis that, in my opinion, we must advance.

[Pravdin] You mentioned that you have visited America. Obviously you also met opponents of Soviet-U.S. cooperation there?

[Ustimenko] Unfortunately, there are plenty of them, but they are not the ones who count in the United States at the moment.

You cannot imagine how much America has changed and how much Americans' attitudes to Soviet people over the past years have changed. Back at the beginning of the 1980's, when I arrived in the United States, an American would literally shy away when he found out that he was dealing with someone from Moscow. But now, Soviet and Russian are the highest recommendations.

In my opinion, a new thinking is operating; there is a perestroyka beginning to operate.

Admittedly, all this will not happen immediately; it will not come with the wave of a wand.

We are clearly proceeding from good to better, so far in the international arena, but this cannot fail to affect our internal situation, too. [passage omitted]

United States & Canada

Baker, Mosbacher Visit to Moscow Assessed

New Forms of Trade Sought

PM1409105190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Beneath the Sign of Helsinki"]

[Text] On 13 September USSR President M.S. Gorbachev received U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, U.S. Secretary of Commerce R. Mosbacher, and 15 top U.S. businessmen making up the presidential trade and economic mission. They head corporations which span the full range of U.S. economic life. They are D. Andreas (Archer-Daniels-Midland Company), L. Cook (Atlantic Richfield Company), K. Derr (Chevron Corporation), J. Murphy (Dresser Industries Inc.), J. Hayes (FORTUNE Magazine), J. Jamison (Glenair International), H. Steward (Louisiana Land and Exploration Company), D. Marron (Paine Webber Group Inc.), D. Kendall (Pepsico Inc.), Ch. Prewett (Prewett Oil Company), A. Mend (Sealand Service Inc.), L. Silk (Shelter Systems Group), M. Hungerford (Transcisco Industries Inc.), W. Esrey (United Telecom Inc.), and J. Kinnear (Texaco Inc.).

Taking part in the ensuing conversation on economic affairs on the Soviet side were Presidential Council Members E.A. Shevardnadze, Yu.D. Maslyukov, and S.S. Shatalin, as well as L.I. Abalkin, K.F. Katushev, A.A. Bessmertnykh, A.S. Chernyayev, A.F. Dobrynin, N.Ya. Petrakov, and A.A. Obukhov.

Taking part on the U.S. side were U.S. Ambassador to the USSR J. Matlock; R. Zoellick, counselor to the Department of State; and Assistant Secretaries of State M. Tutwiler and R. Seitz.

The USSR president welcomed the intiative of J. Baker and R. Mosbacher, who suggested this meeting and undertook its practical organization.

This is the first ever visit to the Soviet Union by such a representative delegation of the U.S. business world, and it is moreover coupled with the efforts being made by both sides along government lines. Bearing this in mind, and in response to the delegation members' request, M.S. Gorbachev outlined the key current problems of the USSR as regards the launching of economic reform. He emphasized that our country now finds itself at a steep turnabout, going through the complex process of laying the foundations of a market economy. The principled elaboration of crucial programs and decisions is approaching its conclusion. We are relying on our own strength, without copying anyone else's models. But we realize that it would be shortsighted to ignore the experience accumulated by the United States in economic development. On entering the stabilization period, aimed at our economy's recovery, we are prepared to attract foreign, including U.S., investment on mutually advantageous terms. I think that the time has come for the West to move from understanding and recognition of our perestroyka to specific cooperation with it. This will pay for itself in all respects.

Developing the ideas expressed by both sides at the Helsinki meeting, an objective conversation ensued about some specific cooperation projects which not only appear useful in themselves but are also capable of giving a fresh impetus to the development of the entire complex of trade and economic collaboration.

The prospects of broad development of ties in the energy sphere occupied a significant position among the questions under discussion.

A shared view was expressed that Soviet-U.S. relations have reached a level of development when new forms of cooperation in trade, the economy, and technology must become the norm. Mutual interest was expressed in the continuation of this work and the further study of specific projects and the specialist training programs associated with them.

Obukhov Calls Ties 'Promising'

LD1409140290 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Konstantin Voytsekhovich]

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Alexey Obukhov described U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's talks in Moscow as a logical continuation of the Helsinki summit. Baker visited Moscow between September 10-13 and had a talk with Mikhail Gorbachev, as well as two long one-to-one meetings with Eduard Shevardnadze.

Obukhov believes that the talks were marked by "mutual attention to interaction between the two states in the commercial and economic spheres."

"For a long time the problem was," he said, "that commercial and economic ties lagged far behind political relations. In the meantime, it is clear that mutually advantageous economic contacts must provide the cement to strengthen political relations."

He said there was "now every ground to say that after Helsinki and Moscow we observe a serious shift in this direction. The prospects for commercial and economic relations have increased and look promising."

Obukhov recalled that Moscow was visited by a presidential commercial and economic mission consisting of 15 prominent American businessmen, which was led by James Baker and U.S. Secretary for Commerce Robert Mosbacher. In addition to meetings with Mikhail Gorbachev, Mosbacher and the American businessmen had a whole line of contacts in Moscow and Leningrad with representatives of major Soviet economic bodies and cooperatives.

They discussed prospects for developing commercial and economic relations, laying emphasis on projects that are already being implemented or could be carried out in future. Serious attention was devoted to the promotion of cooperation in power engineering and oil extraction.

Obukhov said that during the foreign ministers' discussion of the Gulf situation "both sides confirmed their resolution to strive for the restoration of a status-quo, which existed before Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and their intention to strive for a settlement through active political and diplomatic efforts." "The sides did not overlook problems of disarmament, primarily the question of completing the elaboration of a treaty to reduce conventional armaments in Europe and an agreement to cut strategic offensive weapons by 50 percent. "There is very little time left," Obukhov recalled.

"Both sides confirmed in Moscow their determination to observe the fixed time limit. Work is continuing at experts' level and at the negotiating table. The ministers agreed that they would take up these problems again when they met in New York at the end of September in connection with the opening of the the next U.N. General Assembly session. They will examine them attentively to find mutually-acceptable decisions quickly."

"The ministers," Obukhov noted, "touched also on an Afghan settlement." "It appears," he added,"that the stand of Najibullah's government contributes to the settlement of this conflict. It is now possible for the USSR and the United States to reach agreement on their approaches, which, in the final count, could exert a very serious influence on the settlement with U.N. participation."

Obukhov noted that, as shown by the discussion, "there is a good foundation for promoting the postitive tendencies that have already appeared" in Central America.

He noted that "the Soviet side has confirmed its desire for the United States to establish direct contacts with Cuba. But it is for the American side to decide," Obhukov said.

Ryzhkov-Mosbacher Talks Viewed

PM1409121990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Conversation in the Kremlin"]

[Text] On 13 September N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received in the Kremlin U.S. Secretary of Commerce R. Mosbacher and eminent representatives of the U.S. business world who are in the USSR for talks on questions of trade and economic cooperation between the two countries.

N.I. Ryzhkov warmly welcomed the U.S. visitors, including the entrepreneurs D. Andreas, K. Derr, D. Kendall, J. Murphy, and others who are well known in our country and make a weighty contribution to the development of mutually advantageous USSR-U.S. cooperation. A detailed conversation was held on a broad range of problems of Soviet-U.S. relations.

The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers briefed R. Mosbacher and the businessmen accompanying him in detail about the profound changes being implemented in the USSR during the process of political and economic reforms, the forthcoming transition to the market, and the Soviet economy's consistent inclusion in the world economic system.

The conversation proceeded in a frank and friendly atmosphere. Taking part in it were L.D. Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations; E.Ye. Obminskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister; and J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR.

Primakov Discusses U.S. Relations at Seminar

LD1509071690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1950 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 14 Sep (TASS)—The first stage of normalizing and developing relations beween the USSR and the United States, and of giving them a civilized nature has been successfully passed. However, the process of the transition to complete trust between them has still not been completed. This was stated by Yevgeniy Primakov, member of the USSR Presidential Council, speaking here today at a Soviet-U.S. seminar, organized by the USSR Academy of Sciences and the nongovernmental "Cato" institute (USA). Taking part were economists and political scientists, who discussed the problems of switching to a market economy in the Soviet Union, and ways of developing relations between the two countries.

Matters of war and peace depend on Soviet-U.S. relations more than on anything else, Yevgeniy Primakov stressed. But another matter is also dependant on our two countries today—whether or not humanity will be rid of the state of "neither war nor peace," whether it will move reliably into a qualitatively new stage of its development—mutual understanding, interaction, and cooperation for the benefit of the whole indivisible civilization of the world.

China

Shevardnadze Sees 'New Quality' in PRC Ties

LD1609092490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1310 GMT 15 Sep 90

[From the 'International Panorama' program]

[Excerpts] [Announcer A. Bovin] The transition to a new world order presupposes the democratization and demilitarization of international relations on all continents, including, naturally, Asia. And Comrade Shevardnadze's recent trip to China, North Korea, and Japan reaffirmed the continuation of the Soviet Union's overall policy of creating a system of Asian security. [passage omitted] It is against this background that one should view Comrade Shevardnadze's conversation with his Chinese colleague in Harbin. These were businesslike and fruitful talks, working toward further rapprochement between the two great powers.

[Begin recording] [correspondent V. Kulikov] [passage omitted] It is, of course, profoundly symbolic that it was precisely in Harbin that the sides discussed questions of the further improvement of bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and China; the way to full normalization was paved two years ago after Comrade Shevardnadze's meeting with Deng Xiaoping in Shanghai. This was covered in an interview with the foreign minister gave especially for 'International Panorama'.

In Shanghai you said at the time that we should take into the future not ashes, but fire. Two years have passed between Shanghai and Harbin. How dynamic are our relations, and to what degree has this fire warmed them?

[Shevardnadze] Since you have recalled what I said, I would like to add to this that during Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit last year Deng Xiaoping uttered a very graphic phrase: close the past and open the future. I believe that this what is happening. Our meeting today with the minister and the leadership of this very large province, a major town, reaffirms that Soviet-Chinese relations—political, economic, trade and scientific-technical—are developing at a very fast rate and very dynamically in all directions. And this was demonstrated in our talks.

It seems to me very symbolic that in a few days' time—we reached an agreement with the minister on this—wide-ranging talks will begin on mutual reductions in arms and Armed Forces along the Soviet-Chinese border. I think that this is truly unique. And you know how long this border is—7,500 km. I became convinced during our conversations today that our Chinese comrades and friends are sincerely striving to overcome the military confrontation which has been going on for the last nerly 30 years. This truly speaks of a new quality, of new relations, and also speaks of the fact that the joint document signed between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the Chinese leadership—the basic points of this document—are being successfully implemented.

I had the opportunity—true, not for long, just an hour or an hour and a half—to stroll around the city, to feel the atmosphere, the mood of the people and thier attitude toward us. Of course, this was truly, I have no doubt that all this was sincere, because the meetings were spontaneous, chance ones, and the people did not conceal their joy that Soviet-Chinese relations are developing in a very active way and very dynamiclaly. [end recording]

Ministerial Talks on PRC Ties Open in Moscow

Armed Forces Cuts Discussed

LD1309173590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1155 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 13 Sep (TASS)—Mutual reduction of Armed Forces and the strengthening of trust in the military sphere in the region of the Soviet-Chinese border—this is the theme of the talks between delegations of the USSR and the PRC which began here on 10 September.

The first session opened with speeches by Igor Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, and Tian Zengpei, vice minister of foreign affairs of the PRC.

The Soviet representative stressed that the talks which have begun are one of the central links in the process of strengthening Soviet-Chinese relations.

The Chinese side noted the importance of the talks and expressed confidence that they would be crowned with specific results.

The Soviet delegation at the talks is headed by G.V. Kireyev, head of the Socialist Countries of Asia Administration of the USSR Foreign Ministry, and the Chinese side is headed by Liu Guangzhi, deputy chief of the Soviet Union and East European Affairs Department of the PRC Foreign ministry.

'Constructive Attitude' Seen

OW1509102390 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Commentary by Kozlov from the "World Today" program]

[Text] The Soviet-Chinese talks on reducing border troops and strengthening bilateral military trust are currently being held in Moscow.

Our station military observer Kozlov said: As indicated at the Moscow talks, bilateral relations have developed rapidly following the Beijing summit, even in such a sensitive aspect as military detente along the Soviet-Chinese borders. The two countries have held four rounds of talks on this topic.

The experts groups' fruitful work was the foundation for the guiding principles on Soviet-Chinese border disarmament signed by Premier Li Peng during his visit to the USSR last April. These principles delegated that the offensive portions will be curtailed first. According to the bilateral agreement, the small number of border troops remaining will be restructured as defensive troops. The questions of which troops should be reduced, and by how many, and how to reduce them are being discussed at the Moscow talks. These topics are quite delicate, but there are still reasons for optimistic predictions.

Kireyev, head of the Soviet delegation to the talks, said: [Begin Kireyev recording in Russian fading into Mandarin] It is difficult to describe with words the realistic and constructive attitude of both sides. All participants in the negotiations have tried to calmly discuss the issues and to seek solutions. This is the main reason why both sides will be able to reach agreement. [end recording]

In conclusion, Kozlov wrote: If the talks are successful, an agreement will be signed which will be the first agreement on reducing troops and weapons in the Asian-Pacific region.

Soviet-Chinese Rail Connection Completed

PM1409122190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Report by A. Nugmanova, V. Zhilyakov, and A. Abramov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The Soviet and PRC railroads were joined up yesterday at the Druzhba-Alashankou border crossing. Construction of the line had started in the late fifties.

[Nugmanova] For centuries trading caravans traveled through the Dzhungarian Gate from the Orient. Now rails have been laid along this ancient route linking the continents—the Asian-Pacific region and Europe. This is it—the historic moment which had been delayed for 30 years. The last length of track is being laid. The lines finally join up, and the track is open. For the time being the new main line will be used to transport construction materials and fit out stations. Regular traffic, including passenger trains, will begin running in 1992. Currently trains reach our neighbor via Siberia and the Far East—and have to come back the same way. But when regular traffic begins on this line transportation costs will fall many times over. The trip from China to Europe will be reduced by 10,000 km compared with the current sea route.

[Karamanov] Using this line, we can now travel to the Pacific seaboard across China. We can reach the developed countries of the capitalist market—such as Singapore, Malaysia, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and so forth. Even if only a couple of trains use this line every day, they will earn the Chinese and Soviet peoples more than $100 million.

Kim Il-song's Reported PRC Visit Unconfirmed

OW1409130090 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesperson did not refute recent South Korean media reports on DPRK President Kim Il-song's recent secret trip to China and his talks with Chinese leaders there. At the same time, Li Jinhua did not confirm the report either at Thursday's news briefing in Beijing.

South Korean newspapers reported that Kim Il-song met with Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, and other Chinese leaders in Shen-yang. The two sides discussed many questions, including the recent meeting in Seoul between the prime ministers of the DPRK and South Korea, Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's visit to Pyongyang, Soviet-South Korean relations, and PRC-DPRK cooperation during the forthcoming Asian Games.

Northeast Asia

Establishment of Formal Ties With ROK Viewed

SK1709073290 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 16 Sep 90

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] Sixteen May marks the 2nd anniversary of Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at a meeting with the working people in the Krasnoyarsk Kray. In the speech, Gorbachev mentioned issues of consolidating peace in Asia and the Pacific and cooperation for mutual security in that region.

In this connection, station commentator Sergei Petrov writes the following:

The Soviet leader's speeches at Krasnoyarsk and Vladivostok can sum up how his earlier proposal for forming an all-Asian community is being embodied. That proposal has aroused not a small reaction from the participants in that meeting.

If we take into consideration that more than half the Asian countries have various pending relations in their mutual relations or that the Soviet Union has no diplomatic relations with a number of Asian countries, including the ROK, his remarks on commonalities between the Soviet Union and Asia seemed questionable. However, reality rejects such an attitude with the passage of time.

Let us cite facts:

Of course, not every Soviet proposal becomes embodied [word indistinct]. Nevertheless, given the fact that the complicated problems in Asia and the Pacific are interwoven, in no sense can anyone hope that everything will be settled easily.

However, the complete normalization of Sino-Soviet relations, the progress in dialogue on the (?Korean peninsula), and the narrowing of differences in points of contention between the Soviet Union and Japan, and the developing economic assistance among the regional countries are pieces of evidence to cite as cases in point.

The final fact is that even on the Korean peninsula, the source of highest tension in Asia and the Pacific, the situation is improving. This is a wonderful sign of the recent months.

Nevertheless, I would like to make a special note of the fact that relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK are actively developing. Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at Krasnoyarsk can be said to be the starting point of the development of these relations.

Let us recall a few dates. In September 1988 Soviet athletes took part in the Seoul Olympics, and consular departments were opened in Moscow and Seoul in February and March 1990. The date of 4 June, 1990 will be recorded as a special date in history. On that day presidents of the Soviet Union and the ROK met in San Francisco for the first time in history.

As a result, on 26 September when they meet in New York, Eduard Shevardnadze and Choe Ho-chung, foreign ministers of the Soviet Union and the ROK, are expected to make a statement on the establishment of formal diplomatic relations between the two countries.

According to the view held by Moscow, the establishment of such diplomatic relations will contribute to easing tension in Asia and the Pacific and eventually will lead to settling the Korean peninsula question. In other words, the normalization of relations will benefit not only the Soviet Union and the ROK, but also the people in the DPRK.

In this connection, I would like to pay attention again to the Soviet leader's speech at Krasnoyarsk. The Soviet Union is not seeking favorable prestige for itself but a stake in liberating others. The Soviet Union has never sought to gain supremacy at the expense of anyone else.

Our policy not only on Asia but also throughout the world is based on the principle of peaceful coexistence and freedom of choice. Soviet policies are open, and the Soviet Union does not try to conceal anything in its policies, noted Gorbachev in the speeches.

Such speeches reflect that the ways of solving regional and international issues have changed, while indicating that the policy of military confrontation is changing to dialogue and cooperation.

All the countries that are to participate in the building of an Asian community will have to lay a lot of bricks on the foundation, and whether such a community will be built or not depends entirely on them.

Relations Formed Between Soviet-ROK Cities

SK1509112390 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 13 Sep 90

[From the "Program to Highlight the Maritime Kray"]

[Text] Some time ago, three yachts sailed from Nakhodka to Pusan. The major result of the Maritime Kray people's trip to South Korea was to fulfill sisterly relations between Nakhodka and Pusan.

(Viktor Benezhkov), mayor of Nakhodka, says: The proposal for forming sisterly relations was made by the ROK side, and we accepted it. We also intend to solve the matter of ROK participation in the development of a free economic system. We think it would be unreasonable if such companies as the Hyundai and Daewoo groups could not assist by using modern technology. We hope that our sister city, Pusan, will cooperate in the development of Nakhodka.

Ties With Japan, Gorbachev's Planned Visit Noted

OW1409041190 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 11 Sep 90

[Commentary by Moscow radio commentator Kalinin on the prospects for Soviet-Japanese relations—read by announcer]

[Text] As you are aware, the history of Soviet-Japanese relations has not been smooth and has undergone confrontational times when armed clashes occurred. Since the Soviet Union embarked on perestroyka, a substantially positive potential has been fostered in relations between the Soviet Union and other nations. To our regret, however, relations between the Soviet Union and Japan have, until recently, failed to foster such a potential. Today, however, it seems to me that the relations, which cannot be called normal, have recently begun improving, and this is substantiated by results of talks held recently between the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union and Japan in Tokyo. Among other things, I must point out that practical preparations for a visit by President Gorbachev to Japan, scheduled for next spring have already begun and it is not an exaggeration to say that his visit will be the greatest event. I call his visit to Japan the greatest event, not because it will be the first in the history of Soviet-Japan relations, but because summit talks to be held between leaders of the Soviet Union and Japan will give the possibility of drastically improving relations. In this connection, Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu has expressed his hopes for such an improvement. Moreover, two-thirds of the respondents to a MAINICHI SHIMBUN poll are in favor of his view. What is important in strengthening Soviet-Japan relations is the question of concluding a peace treaty. I think President Gorbachev's planned visit to Japan will contribute to resolving the question. Regarding this question, there has been definite progress. In particular, the two counties have decided to shift from discussions of how to conclude the treaty to exchanging each other's draft treaty, within the framework of Soviet-Japan joint working group on the peace treaty. However, I have to point out that the so-called northern territories issue is in the way of concluding a peace treaty. In this connection, MAINICHI SHIMBUN hoped that President Gorbachev would have a correct understanding of the Japanese people's opinion and promote the improvement in bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and Japan, and it is quite natural for the daily to hold such a hope. I think it should be held by Japanese leaders. Until recently, the Japanese leaders have linked Japan's cooperation with the Soviet Union to the solution of the territorial issue. In the latest opinion poll, more than half the respondents held the view that it is necessary to promote economic relations between Japan and the Soviet Union, separate from the territorial issue. The very existence of the territorial issue should not become a reason for stalemating relations between the two countries in areas other than that area. Although the territorial issue cannot be resolved at a stroke, the two countries should look for mutually acceptable compromises, with a flexible attitude from the standpoint of respecting new political thinking and the interests of the people.

In this connection, what is regarded as most realistic is Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's proposal that leaders of the Soviet Union and Japan issue a statement calling on their nations to stop seeing each other as hostile. It is clear that the partnership can better resolve a long-standing issue than hostile relations. The Soviet Union does not see Japan as its enemy. The Soviet Union is turning its attention to Prime Minister Kaifu's decision that wording of the Soviet threat to Japan be deleted from the Japanese defense white paper. I think that contacts between the two countries in the military area will make it possible for them to further strengthen their relations of trust. In this connection, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze made a concrete proposal that the two countries make public their military doctrines to each other and make prior notifications and invite observers when they conduct large-scale military exercises, and exchange military delegations, as well as mutual visits of warships and air squadrons. Needless to say, it takes time to examine Soviet initiatives in the military area. As you are aware, Joint Staff Council Chairman Terashima has appraised positively the Soviet initiatives and this deserves a welcome. I hope that a situation would be created, taking advantage of the Soviet initiatives, to put the cooperation between the two countries on track in promoting disarmament and security in Asia.

As indicated by Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's recent visit to Japan, our two nations do possess such potential. Above all, it should be remembered that the statement was a joint one on the Mideast crisis, indicating the intention, shared by the Soviet Union and Japan, to take mutual action to settle an international dispute for the first time.

Moreover, I think it should also be pointed out that the Soviet Union has supported Japan's proposal for holding a conference of foreign ministers of Asian nations in New York, where the UN General Assembly is scheduled to open on 27 September. Incidentally, this proposal corresponds with Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's idea of holding all-Asian foreign ministerial consultations in Vladivostok in 1993.

When all these facts are taken into consideration, there seems to be certainly sufficient grounds to say that Soviet-Japanese relations are now entering a new stage. We really hope that this process will become steady in nature, instead of being just temporary. We can say that the two nations must have strong will and make persistent efforts to achieve this objective.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentaries on Cambodian Settlement Continue

Cambodian Premier Calls Meeting

OW1509141790 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Commentary by (Ganshen), read by announcer]

[Text] Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen has called for an urgent meeting of the Cambodian Supreme National Council in order to acheive the earliest possible cease-fire and facilitate implementation of the agreement reached by the four Cambodian factions at the recent Jakarta conference on forming a delegation from the Supreme National Council to represent Cambodia in the UN General Assembly.

Prince Ranariddh, another member of the Supreme National Council, made a similar appeal. Both men went to Bangkok after the Jakarta conference to discuss steps for resolving the Cambodian conflict with representatives of the Thai leadership.

Our commentator (Ganshen) writes:

Hun Sen maintained that the agreement on forming the Supreme National Council by the Cambodian factions should not be looked upon as mere empty words. It is hard to disagree with Hun Sen's opinion. The results of the Jakarta conference have been highly commended by the USSR, China, the United States, Vietnam, Thailand and some other countries. People in these countries maintain that immediate action must be taken to consolidate the achievements.

It is regrettable that even against this optimistic background people still see worrisome omens. A broadcast by the clandestine radio of the Khmer Rouge, monitored in Bangkok, announced that the Khmer Rouge still wants to take military action regardless of agreements between Hun Sen and the resistance forces. This broadcast said that though all conflicting factions have reached agreements in Jakarta, the Khmer Rouge will continue fighting until the last Vietnamese soldier withdraws from Cambodia.

However, the people know that there are not any Vietnamese troops in Cambodia. Most independent observers who have been to Cambodia have confirmed this fact. The Pol Pot element's allegation that there are Vietnamese soldiers in Cambodia is merely a pretext for continuing the armed struggle. In this regard, if their intentions do not change soon, the implementation of the Jakarta agreements will be jeopardized.

According to a Thai general interviewed by a REUTER reporter in Bangkok, it would be too optimistic to expect that a ready solution of the Cambodian conflict is within reach. He stated that he thinks the guerrillas will continue fighting.

I hope that this prediction does not come true. However, it would be a mistake not to consider this the opinion of the Thai military. Simple logic tells us that perhaps the Khmer Rouge, a clique that has attempted over the years to score a military victory in Cambodia, may not immediately drop its butchers' knives and settle for peace.

Our station commentator (Ganshen) writes: Therefore, I think China can exert decisive influence on the Pol Pot elements. Many things also depend on Thailand where there are no more Pol Pot elements. Perhaps Hun Sen's meeting with Thai representatives may help settle this issue.

'Major Breakthrough' Toward Peace

PM1409135390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Sep 90 First Edition p 5

[Article by Viktor Pritula under the rubric: "Viewpoint": "Cambodian Knot Loosens"]

[Text] At the conclusion of an informal meeting on Cambodia in Jakarta a major breakthrough was accomplished toward peace in the country, which has been engulfed by the flames of war throughout the last 20 years. Perhaps the formation of a Supreme National Council of Cambodia, which is needed in the transition period, can be considered this meeting's most important result. The Supreme National Council is seen as the personification of Cambodia's independence, sovereignty, and unity. Its purpose is to represent its country abroad and take Cambodia's place at the United Nations. This organ will perform the authorities' functions in Cambodia until a new government is formed following free general elections. Prior to the Jakarta meeting the question of authority in Cambodia in the transition period was the main stumbling block.

When at the previous meeting in Tokyo of the warring Cambodian sides the "Khmer Rouge" began to wreck the compromise agreements worked out there and started to escalate military actions in Cambodia, unraveling the Cambodian knot, it seemed, was put off for an indeterminate time.

Opposition coalition leader Sihanouk, having put his signature to the Tokyo agreements, went back on his word under pressure from the "Khmer Rouge" and started to demand that Phnom Penh increase the opposition's representation in the Supreme National Council, although the "six-plus-six" formula had been agreed in Tokyo, under which the Phnom Penh government and the coalition were to have six representatives each on the council.

The Phnom Penh government categorically refused these demands, since concessions of this kind to the "Khmer Rouge" could lead to restoration of the regime of genocide in Cambodia in the transition period. Even after the Tokyo meeting Phnom Penh continued to undertake active steps in search of a peaceful solution to the problem. Such a position cannot fail to win increasing recognition from many states and international organizations. The latest evidence of the growing prestige of Hun Sen's government was the U.S. decision to begin direct talks with Phnom Penh aimed at facilitating a settlement of the Cambodian situation.

An important step on the way to ending the war in Cambodia was the USSR's proposal of a moratorium on military supplies to the warring sides, which was recently supported by China. In this context it is worth noting such a significant tendency of the present time as the unanimity between the five permanent members of the UN Security Council on settling regional conflicts—be it the war in Cambodia or the crisis in the Persian Gulf. The plan devised by "the five" for the comprehensive settlement of the situation in Cambodia comprises five sections—transitional measures concerning the governing of Cambodia during the preelection period; military aspects of the settlement; elections under the UN aegis; protection of human rights; and international guarantees of Cambodia's independent and neutral status.

The Cambodian sides at the Jakarta meeting adopted this plan as a whole as the basis for settling the conflict.

The world public welcomes the Jakarta results, hoping that the agreements reached there will become a major step on the way to ending the long-standing military confrontation in Cambodia.

Near East & South Asia

Yazov Says Alliance With Iraq Ended in 1972

OW1709144690 Tokyo KYODO in English 1428 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, Sept. 17 KYODO—Soviet Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov said Monday that the Soviet Union ended its military alliance with Iraq following a friendship and cooperation treaty concluded with Iraq in 1972.

Yazov told a delegation of editorial writers from the member newspapers of KYODO NEWS SERVICE that although political aspects of the treaty remain intact, the military aspects were rendered irrelevant following Iraq's August 2 invasion of its tiny, oil-rich neighbor Kuwait.

The Soviet Union, in a rare show of solidarity with the West, has condemned the Iraqi aggression and supported the United Nations Security Council resolutions calling for immediate withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait, but refrained from utilizing Soviet forces to solve the Gulf crisis.

Yazov stressed that Soviet military advisors still in Iraq had never been engaged in military action, planning or deployments. He said the Soviet military officials are on a technical assistance mission.

Yazov reiterated that the Soviet Union does not intend to comply with the U.S. request to join the U.S.-led multinational forces deployed in the Gulf region.

He said the Soviet Union can exercise political clout over Iraq by insisting that the Gulf crisis be resolved politically, in contrast to the militarily active U.S.

It is for this purpose that Soviet military personnel are still stationed in Iraq and the cooperation treaty is maintained, Yazov said.

On its South Korea policy, Yazov said diplomatic relations between the two nations will likely be established before the end of the year.

Yazov was the first Soviet official who has confirmed the two nations will normalize diplomatic ties at such an early date.

He disclosed that North Korea was upset by Moscow's rapprochement with South Korea.

Turning to Soviet-Japan relations, Yazov refuted a suggestion from some Soviet academics on the return of a group of islands off the northeastern coast of Hokkaido, saying that the territorial dispute will not be resolved as long as survivors of the war live in the Soviet Union.

The defense minister said Soviet troops remain on the islands because they are Soviet territory as well as to confront Japan's Self Defense Forces in Hokkaido.

He rejected the idea of an early withdrawal of the Soviet troops from the islands, noting the strategic importance of having them at the confluence of the Sea of Japan and the Pacific Ocean.

The Habomais, Etorofu, Kunashiri and Shikotan were seized by Soviet troops from Japan at the end of World War II.

The territorial dispute has prevented fully developed cooperation between the two nations.

During his visit to Japan, expected in April next year, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev may visit Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the world's first cities hit by atomic bombs, Yazov said.

Israeli Ministers Continue Visit to Moscow

Delegates Meet With Gorbachev

TA1409182890 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1800 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] The three-hour meeting between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Israeli Ministers Moda'i and Ne'eman is about to end in the Kremlin. Our special correspondent in Moscow Meron Tzur reports that the plane aboard which the two flew from Vienna to Moscow was two hours late, and as soon as it landed, the two were driven to the Kremlin where Gorbachev awaited them. The meeting with the Soviet president was brought forward by 24 hours because of Gorbachev's tight time schedule. With the exception of the president, the meeting is attended only by the two Israeli guests and by Ne'eman's adviser Eliyahu Zemtsov, who had set up the meeting. The Soviets did not invite the Israeli envoy in the Soviet Union, Arye Levin.

In a short while, a reception and banquet in honor of the two ministers will be held by members of the Soviet Presidential Council. The events will be attended by Aleksandr Yakovlev, the Kremlin's number two, as well as Gorbachev's adviser Nikolay Petrakov.

Tomorrow Ministers Moda'i and Ne'eman will hold talks with Soviet Finance Minister Vladimir Pavlov and with the presidents of the Academy of Sciences and the Chamber of Commerce. Their visit will end on Sunday morning, when they will return to Israel.

Gorbachev on Strengthening Ties

TA1509054490 Jerusalem Domestic Service in English 0500 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has expressed his intention to further strengthen Moscow's relations with Jerusalem. The Soviet leader's comments came during yesterday's two-and-a-half-hour meeting in Moscow with Finance Minister Moda'i and Science Minister Ne'eman. The landmark meeting was the first time Israeli ministers had met with a Soviet minister [as heard] since Moscow cut ties with Jerusalem in 1967. During the talks, which were also attended by the science minister's adviser, Prof. Eliyahu Zemtsov, Gorbachev hinted at the possibility that Moscow will use Israel as a bridge between the Soviet Union and the United States, the EEC, and the Eastern European states.

The two Israeli ministers refused to say at the end of the talks whether any change in diplomatic relations between the two countries was in the offing. They also refused to provide further details of the talks, saying that they must first report to the government in Jerusalem. The Voice of Israel's reporter in Moscow says that mutual exchange visits by trade and business delegations can be expected in the near future.

The president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences is also expected to visit Israel. During yesterday's meeting, the ministers also broached the question of aliyah. They described the atmosphere at the talks as very warm.

Today, Ministers Moda'i and Ne'eman will meet the Soviet finance minister, Vladimir Pavlov; the president of the Academy of Sciences; and the president of the Chamber of Commerce.

An Israeli Foreign Ministry delegation held talks at the Foreign Ministry in Moscow yesterday. The discussions centered on the Gulf crisis, the Middle East peace process, and the forthcoming meeting planned between Foreign Minister Levi and his Soviet counterpart, Shevardnadze, in New York.

Ministers Meet Yakovlev, Pavlov

TA1509095290 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0900 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Ministers Yitzhaq Moda'i and Yuval Ne'eman are expected to confer with Soviet Finance Minister Vladimir Pavlov at this time. Our correspondent Meron Tzur reports that this morning the two ministers met with heads of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and with Aleksandr Yakovlev, a top USSR official. Ministers Moda'i and Ne'eman will report on their talks in Moscow upon their return to Israel tomorrow.

Ministry Summarizes Consultations

LD1509152190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1410 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 15 Sep (TASS)—Asked by the TASS diplomatic correspondent to comment on consultations between experts from the Soviet and Israeli Foreign Ministries, which were held in Moscow on 14 September, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said the following:

The consultations were held in the context of preparations for the meeting between the foreign ministers of the two countries, which is scheduled to be held in New York during the 45th UN General Assembly session. The Soviet and Israeli experts discussed the situation in the Near East and other questions of mutual interest.

It was noted that the crisis in the Persian Gulf region has highlighted the need for the earliest possible settlement of all other conflicts in the region, above all the Arab-Israeli conflict. The urgent need to create regional security structures and to draw up measures designed to facilitate the establishment of peace and stability for all the peoples of the Near East was stressed regarding this.

Talks Termed 'Very Useful'

TA1509203690 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 2000 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Soviet Finance Minister Valentin Pavlov and Aleksandr Yakovlev, Gorbachev's close adviser, say that the talks that they and Gorbachev held with Israeli Ministers Moda'i and Ne'eman were very useful, and Moscow is greatly interested in expanding trade relations with Israel. In an interview they granted our correspondent Meron Tzur at their Kremlin office after their meeting with Ministers Moda'i and Ne'eman, these two top Soviet leaders declared that the time has come to establish full commercial relations with Israel. Ministers Moda'i and Ne'eman conferred with the Soviet finance minister for more than two and half hours and discussed increased cooperation.

This afternoon the two also met with Aleksandr Yakovlev. Later, they stated that the Soviets have taken a large step forward in their willingness to rapidly advance economic relations between the two countries.

The president of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce has asked the Israeli ministers to set up a chamber of commerce in Moscow at once. He said that an office had already been prepared in the center of Moscow to serve Israeli businessmen. He also promised that Israeli businessmen will be allowed freedom of movement throughout the Soviet Union so that they can strike business deals. As an example of a deal with which the Soviets are greatly pleased, he mentioned the activity of the Eisenberg group which undertook the development of cotton areas in Uzbekistan and turned this into a success story.

At the moment, Ministers Moda'i and Ne'eman are giving a dinner for their Soviet hosts.

'Meaningful Breakthrough' Seen

TA1509091890 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0805 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Telephone interview with Israeli correspondent Meron Tzur in Moscow by Dalya Ya'iri—live]

[Excerpt] [Tzur] [passage omitted] Ministers Yitzhaq Moda'i and Yuval Ne'eman regard the outcome of the meeting with Gorbachev as a meaningful breakthrough that will lead to a further strengthening of relations, which are assuming a practical character. The meeting between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and the two ministers—Yitzhaq Moda'i and Yuval Ne'eman—last night in the Kremlin was held in a convivial and friendly atmosphere, and a very warm attitude toward Israel was felt. Mikhail Gorbachev laid before his Israeli guests his political outlook on the crisis in the Soviet social and economic systems. He also addressed, among other things, the serious crisis in the Persian Gulf and told the two about his meetings with President George Bush in Helsinki. He said that a way must be found to resolve the crisis without using the military option, which is dangerous to both the Middle East and the world at large.

The meeting, in the words of Minister Yitzhaq Moda'i, was historic. It marks a step up in Soviet-Israeli relations despite the political differences of opinion, says Yuval Ne'eman, minister of science and technology, and of energy and infrastructure.

During their long meeting, which lasted approximately two and one-half hours, Gorbachev hinted at the possibility that Israel would serve as a bridge between the United States and the EEC, on the one side, and the USSR and the East European countries, on the other, thanks to Israel's commercial, scientific, and technological capabilities. He expressed the intention to tighten relations between Israel and the Soviet Union further—though all of that was expressed in veiled references, not directly.

The two ministers emerged from the meeting with the deep feeling and knowledge that Gorbachev may work to see that their discussions have substantial results, such as practical measures for developing trade and scientific ties, along with continuing political dialogue. They refused to tell me whether specific immediate actions had been agreed upon, but I have learned that commercial and scientific delegations are about to exchange visits to Moscow and Jerusalem as early as the next few weeks.

The meeting was attended by Aleksandr Yakovlev, the number two man in the top Soviet leadership and Gorbachev's right hand, as well as by Eliyahu Zemtsov, the science and technology minister's adviser on Soviet affairs and, one can safely admit, the man behind the scenes who arranged this historic meeting. This meeting was preceded by two meetings between Zemtsov and Gorbachev during the past week to finalize yesterday's meeting, which was held almost at the last minute and quite by surprise. Incidentally, the meeting was advanced by 24 hours because the ministers did not wish to violate the Sabbath. Therefore, immediately upon descending from the Aeroflot plane, which landed 30 minutes late, they were ushered to the Kremlin in a limousine.

The ministers returned to their hotel on foot, a 40-minute walk, to avoid desecrating the Sabbath.

[Ya'iri] Meron Tzur, the one person who was absent from the meeting in Moscow was the Israeli representative, Arye Levin. Why was that?

[Tzur] Arye Levin, Israel's envoy in Moscow and the head of the Israeli delegation here, did not attend the meeting in the Kremlin at the instruction of the Soviet president's office, which limited the number of participants in the meeting to only four: two from the Soviet side, Mikhail Gorbachev and Aleksandr Yakovlev, and two from the Israeli side, Yitzhaq Moda'i, Yuval Ne'eman, and Eliyahu Zemtsov, who organized the meeting. The hints provided here in Moscow could be interpreted as meaning that the decision to circumvent Arye Levin was deliberate and that the meetings were held at the highest echelon without his direct involvement in organizing them. He was therefore left behind, perhaps because of the currently unclear relationship between Arye Levin and the top Soviet leadership—and primarily the Soviet Foreign Ministry, which intentionally avoids inviting him to routine meetings.

Yet there was an exception to that rule last night when Arye Levin attended the meeting between three of the Israeli Foreign Ministry's assistant directors general and senior officials from the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Middle East Department, in which bilateral and political issues were concluded without any connection to the meeting between the two ministers and President Gorbachev.

[Ya'iri] Meaning that those measures were not aimed at the Israeli Foreign Ministry, but were directed personally at Arye Levin?

[Tzur] That would be one way of interpreting it.

[Ya'iri] Thank you very much.

Interviews With Israeli Ministers on Talks

Moda'i Discusses Economic Ties

TA1509100490 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0805 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Telephone interview with Finance Minister Yitzhaq Moda'i in Moscow by Dalya Ya'iri—live]

[Text] [Ya'iri] Good morning, Finance Minister Yitzhaq Moda'i.

[Moda'i] Good morning and a peaceful Sabbath to you.

[Ya'iri] Normally we would have used an opportunity for an interview with you on the "Weekly Newsreel" to ask you extensively about the economic program you presented, only to vanish immediately afterward—though now we know to where.

[Moda'i] Guilty as charged.

[Ya'iri] Perhaps you could tell us, first of all, what was achieved in this historic meeting between yourself and Gorbachev?

[Moda'i] This is a most surprising development. It was hard for us to expect to have such a thorough and protracted conversation and—if I may add with all modesty, such a hearty talk—with the president of the Soviet Union, who is also the father of perestroyka and is determined to implement his plan or this new concept in the lives of the Soviet people. The subjects we discussed encompassed a broad range, but ultimately we focused on the Middle East, as well as on the two obvious centers of attention, for these interlocutors; namely, the Soviet Union and the State of Israel.

[Ya'iri] What is the bottom line? What is there for us in all of this?

[Moda'i] I think that all this business could have an extremely far-reaching impact on Israel's international standing. Any rapprochement with the Soviet Union means, from our standpoint, additional world support for Israel and possibly also, on the other hand, less potential pressure on us. This, however, pertains to the political sphere.

In the economic area, the USSR itself currently requires temporary assistance until it can again fully use its own economic potential, which is enormous. I believe anything Israel can contribute in this direction, be it even a modest contribution, will be credited to us as overall support and will, in the final analysis, also result in economic rewards for the Israeli economy and its development.

[Ya'iri] Do you have any details you could give us? Have any concrete details been concluded?

[Moda'i] Yes, we reached specific conclusions on certain matters, but one does not discuss details with the president of the Soviet Union, but general frameworks, outlines of possibilities in various directions. The specifics will be discussed at a later stage, perhaps even during our stay here—but if not, then in future contacts. In any event, the intention is not to deal with general issues on the ideological or broad planes, but rather to deal with, develop, coordinate, and assist in very concrete issues in the various areas related to the economic sectors and bilateral economic ties. Unfortunately we still do not have formal relations with the USSR, but that should in no way block the fostering of economic ties and other potentials in this sphere. As my friend Professor Ne'eman, the science and technology minister, will soon explain, there is also a vast range of things that can be done in terms of cooperation and research and development. The USSR is a continent, a superpower. Cooperation with it is virtually limitless—even now, but most certainly in the future.

[Ya'iri] Minister Moda'i, when discussing general topics with the Soviet president, why was the foreign minister excluded?

[Moda'i] I was not the one to organize that meeting. We are guests here; we were invited. The foreign minister represents diplomatic relations, and I hope that with time he too will be invited here, with all the resultant connotations that such an invitation—when it comes—will have.

[Ya'iri] Is there any significance to the fact that the Israeli representative in Moscow did not attend the meeting?

[Moda'i] No, this fact has no import whatsoever. We were whisked straight from the airport to the Soviet president, who actually extended personal invitations on a name basis only to Prof. Ne'eman and myself, as well as to Professor Zemtsov, who has been here for some time and who was instrumental in the arranging this meeting. We were rushed there to avoid violating the sanctity of the Sabbath by holding it on that holy day. We were very pleased that the meeting was brought forward.

I do not think that there is anything indicative in this matter, apart from the fact that, unfortunately, as we all know, we do not have diplomatic relations, which is why no diplomatic representative can participate in such meetings for now. I hope the time for that will come, and soon.

[Ya'iri] Did you discuss aliyah?

[Moda'i] Yes, that issue was raised during the meeting, as did ways to improve the possibilities, but I would prefer to keep still on that matter.

[Ya'iri] Thank you very much.

Science Minister on Relations

TA1509104390 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0805 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Telephone interview with Yuval Ne'eman, minister of science and technology, and of energy and infrastructure, in Moscow by Dalya Ya'iri—live]

[Text] [Ya'iri] Good morning, Science and Energy Minister Yuval Ne'eman.

[Ne'eman] Good morning.

[Ya'iri] Did you discuss science and energy during that meeting?

[Ne'eman] In our conversation with the president, we mentioned a host of subjects. Naturally, science was broached—after all, he did invite the minister of science and energy. Without doubt, the new economic structure in the USSR has bolstered the status of science. In fact, the Soviet Academy of Sciences, which is in fact a ministry of science with everything that such an office entails, is as powerful as a state. I am pleased that we will really be able to cooperate with the Soviet scientists and the Academy on a whole range of subjects that will benefit both countries. I expect....

[Ya'iri] Could you try to be a little more specific—for example, by telling us whether solar energy was mentioned?

[Ne'eman] I will not go into detail at this stage. Let me only say that on 15 November, Marchuk, the Soviet deputy prime minister, science minister, and president of the Academy, will arrive in Israel. We have already, by correspondence, prepared an agreement that we will then be able to sign, which will truly involve cooperation on a long list of issues.

[Ya'iri] In other words, you bring home with you a range of achievements.

[Ne'eman] I would say that what we are bringing home is primarily the new atmosphere. As the number two person in the USSR, Mr. Aleksandr Yakovlev, said: Relations between the two countries have reached a new level that I presume is the last one prior to the establishment of full ties.

[Ya'iri] Yuval Ne'eman, thank you very much and a good Sabbath.

[Ne'eman] A good Sabbath to you, too.

Israeli Housing Minister Sharon's Visit Assailed

PM1709093390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Sep 90 Second Edition p 4

[Article by V. Nefedov "Rejoinder": "What is A. Sharon Doing in Moscow?"]

[Excerpts] Recently VOICE OF ISRAEL reported that Ariel Sharon, Israeli minister of construction and housing, is visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Moscow City Soviet. One aim of his visit is to negotiate the construction of apartments and houses for Jews migrating to Israel. The purpose, apparently, is to conclude a major deal which Soviet housing construction combines will implement. The radio station reported that Sharon walked through Red Square and the Moscow streets, people recognized him, and showed him due consideration. Sharon called off his meeting with the chairman of the Moscow City Soviet which was to have taken place last Saturday because that day is sacred to all orthodox Jews and switched it to Tuesday.

An intriguing report, isn't it? We rang the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee's administration of external relations. No, we know nothing about this, they told the editorial office. The next call was to the assistant of the Moscow City Soviet chairman. There, too, they know nothing about Sharon's activities and there were no meetings planned between him and G.Kh. Popov either for Saturday or Tuesday.

Meanwhile, as TASS reported on 10 September, A. Sharon, Israel's minister of construction and housing and head of the committee for the settlement of immigrants, arrived in Moscow last Thursday at the private invitation of the "Modul" construction cooperative, an invitation supported by the Moscow City Soviet. According to unconfirmed information, the cooperative is planning to take part in the construction of apartment blocks in Israel in exchange for supplies of fruit and vegetables from Israel to Moscow.

So, who is this A. Sharon and why doesn't the Moscow City Soviet know about his "private" visit to Moscow? And do we really need Israeli fruit and vegetables now when our own harvest is rotting in the fields?

It is no exaggeration to say that Ariel Sharon is one of the most odious individuals in Israel. [passage omitted]

After Tel Aviv's inglorious adventure in Lebanon and the savage and monstrous carnage committed under the protection of the Israeli Army in the Palestinian camps of Sabra and Shatila in September 1982, Sharon lost his post as defense minister. He has since been called the "butcher of Sabra and Shatila," the "executioner," "bloody murderer," and "fascist." [passage omitted]

Now this "executioner" is strolling around Red Square and the streets of Moscow. I would like to ask: Do our cooperative owners and latter-day "democrats" know whose hand they are shaking and with whom they want to do a deal, if the information about the purpose of his is correct? And will Muscovites have a clear conscience when they serve up fruit and vegetables cultivated by the slave labor of Palestinian women and children?

As the USSR Foreign Ministry Consular Administration told the editorial office by phone, virtually all restrictions on Israeli citizens' entering our country have now been lifted. They can enter the country at the invitation of the most diverse organizations, enterprises, or private individuals. So, esteemed reader, do not be surprised if, for example, you bump into Meir Kahane, the well known terrorist organization ringleader, on the street. He may be visiting us at the invitation of a cooperative trading in "varenki" [slang word for inferior-quality jeans that have been boiled to simulate aging].

Saudi Foreign Minister Prince Sa'ud Arrives

To Establish Diplomatic Ties

LD1609133390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1301 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 September (TASS)—TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Zharkov reports:

Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal Al Sa'ud, minister of foreign affairs of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, is arriving in the Soviet Union today. During his visit it is planned to sign a treaty on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries, the USSR Foreign Ministry informed the TASS correspondent.

Commenting on attaining such an accord, Sergey Kirpichenko, a representative of the Soviet foreign policy department, stressed that the Soviet Union's relations with the Arab world "are receiving good reinforcement."

The question of establishing official contacts between the USSR and Saudi Arabia, he noted, has for a long time, as the saying goes, "been hanging in the air." Such a state of affairs seemed unnatural to both sides. Nevertheless, some obstacles remained. In particular, Saudi Arabia named as the main hindrance the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan. After their withdrawal and the conclusion of the Geneva accords, which the Saudi leadership welcomed, this obstacle was eliminated.

At the same time, it should be noted that before this, too, the USSR and Saudi Arabia exchanged opinions at various levels and discussed Middle East problems and the state of the world oil market. Recently humanitarian contacts have begun to develop broadly. Thus, this year, around 1,500 Soviet pilgrims visited Mecca.

The program of the stay of Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal Al Sa'ud to Moscow envisions talks with the Soviet leadership and a meeting with journalists.

Welcomed by Shevardnadze

LD1609145590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1437 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 September (TASS)—TASS correspondent Sergey Zharkov reports:

Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal Al Sa'ud, the foreign minister of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, arrived for a visit to the Soviet Union today. The program for the visit envisages talks between the Saudi representative and the Soviet leadership as well as the signing of a treaty establishing diplomatic relations between the two countries.

Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, met Sa'ud al-Faysal Al Sa'ud at the airport.

Begins Discussions 17 Sep

LD1709074590 Moscow TASS in English 0717 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—Talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal Al Sa'ud, the foreign minister of Saudi Arabia, began here today. The prince arrived in the USSR on Sunday [16 September].

The negotiations will focus on the resumption of relations by exchanging diplomatic representatives. According to reliable sources in the Soviet Foreign Ministry, a communique on the reciprocal reopening of diplomatic missions in the two countries is expected to be signed today.

Saudi Arabia was the first Arab state with which the Soviet Union established diplomatic relations in 1926. In 1930 the diplomatic agency and consulate general of the USSR in Jeddah were transformed into a diplomatic mission. Soviet representatives left Saudi Arabia on the eve of World War II and the two countries have not resumed diplomatic relations to this day.

The agenda of the Saudi foreign minister's visit to the USSR envisages talks with Soviet leaders and also a meeting with journalists.

Supports Normalized Relations

LD1709123190 Moscow TASS in English 1204 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his Saudi counterpart Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal al Sa'ud have gone on record here for normalising diplomatic relations and exchanging ambassadors between the two countries, journalists were told after the Soviet-Saudi talks at the level of foreign ministers.

The Saudi foreign minister arrived in Moscow Sunday evening [16 September] and met Shevardnadze today. They discussed bilateral relations, the Gulf crisis and other international problems.

Shevardnadze told journalists after the talks that a preliminary agreement was reached to restore diplomatic relations and expressed the hope that the question would be fully settled during President Gorbachev's meeting with the prince.

Diplomatic relations between the two countries were frozen after the Soviet Union recalled its diplomatic mission from Riyadh in 1938.

Calls for Iraqi Withdrawal

LD1709124490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1155 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 17 Sep—TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Zharkov reports:

The foreign ministers of the Soviet Union and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia called at talks in Moscow today for the very rapid withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait and for Baghdad to fulfill unconditionally the UN Security Council resolution. Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal Al Sa'ud arrived in the Soviet Union yesterday evening and had a long meeting with Eduard Shevardnadze today in a private room at the USSR Foreign Ministry.

Addressing journalists at the end of their talks the Soviet and Saudi ministers announced that in considering the crisis in the Persian Gulf they noted that the positions of the two countries and their fundamental assessments do not differ: both Saudi Arabia and the USSR prefer a peaceful solution to this problem. The sides, they stressed, favor Iraqi withdrawing its troops from Kuwait as rapidly as possible and the unconditional fulfillment of the UN Security Council resolution.

"We hope," the Saudi minister stated, "that faced with the unanimity of the world community Iraq will agree to the urgent and unconditional withdrawal of its troops from Kuwait and to restoring legality."

Gorbachev, Mitterrand Converse About Gulf Crisis

LD1609204590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2013 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 17 Sep (TASS)—In accordance with the agreement on maintaining permanent contacts, a telephone conversation took place on Sunday between M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR, and Francois Mitterand, president of France.

During the talk, the situation in the Persian Gulf was touched upon. In particular, a principled assessment was given of the attack last Friday [14 September] by Iraqi soldiers on the residence of the French ambassador to Kuwait and the abduction of three French citizens. The Soviet side evaluated this action as an unacceptable step, stirring up of tension in the region. The Soviet leadership sharply condemns this action by Iraq and considers that it only complicates the quest for a peaceful solution to the conflict, it was pointed out during the telephone talk.

The discussion by M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterand of the situation in the Persian Gulf confirmed the convergence of position of the Soviet Union and France, the essence of which lies in the rigorous and strict implementation of the UN Security Council resolutions.

Reports Continue on Persian Gulf Crisis

Foreign Ministry on Kidnappings

LD1609110790 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 16 TASS—A statement by a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman was circulated here today, saying as follows:

According to reports, Iraqi servicemen stormed into the premises of the French diplomatic mission in Kuwait on September 14 and captured several Frenchmen whose destiny is unknown.

The Soviet Union condemns this action by Iraqi occupying authorities, since it is inadmissible from the viewpoint of international law, tramples underfoot the rules of civilised relations between states and is aggravating even more the situation in the Gulf and around it.

UN Approves Food Aid

LD1409132490 Moscow TASS in English 1300 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Maslov]

[Text] United Nations, September 14 TASS—The U.N. Security Council approved on Thursday Resolution 666, allowing deliveries of humanitarian food aid in the case of urgent need to the civilian population and foreigners in Iraq or Kuwait. The resolution notes that the delivery and distribution of aid must be done, depending on the availability of food products in the countries, through the United Nations and in collaboration with the International Red Cross or other humanitarian bodies. It must be distributed by them and under their supervision.

The text of the resolution was subjected to long consultations and adopted late in the evening by a majority vote. Cuba and Yemen voted against.

Cuba's alternative draft did not get the needed number of votes. Only Cuba, Yemen and China voted for it. The Soviet Union abstained. The draft envisaged humanitarian aid deliveries without any preliminary conditions, involving the study of the food situation in Iraq and Kuwait and the elaboration of distribution procedures. This, in the opinion of its authors, will cause delays in the delivery of food to those who need it.

Security Council members noted that Iraq did not wish to have contacts with international bodies in matters concerning food delivery and distribution. This is why it is imperative to create corresponding control mechanisms so that the humanitarian aid would really reach those who need it most in Iraq and Kuwait.

"The international consensus on Iraqi aggression is unquestionable," Soviet delegate Yuliy Vorontsov told the Security Council. "Iraq must unconditionally withdraw from Kuwait and allow the lawful government to be restored there. It must release all hostages in Iraq and Kuwait.

"From the very outbreak of the crisis, the Soviet Union put emphasis on collective efforts based on the use of all the U.N. potential and mechanisms, giving preference to political-diplomatic methods of solving the crisis. The Soviet delegation is convinced that only by implementing Security Council resolutions will it be possible to prevent a further dangerous aggravation of the crisis and to restore the situation which existed prior to the Iraqi invasion.

"The Soviet delegation realises that the sanctions, if fully implemented as envisaged in Resolution 661, are undoubtedly linked with serious economic, social and humanitarian problems affecting many states. The regime, which the Security Council has established in respect to Iraq, creates quite a few serious problems, including some financial and economic difficulties for our country, too.

"At the same time, we must not overlook the fact that the main cause of all these difficulties is Iraq's continuing occupation of Kuwait and by no means the sanctions adopted in response. If we overlook this principal point, or try to play it down, we risk straying off the course indicated by the U.N. Charter.

"The sanctions were a natural and necessary reaction to aggression. They are fully in keeping with the U.N. Charter, which all the members of this organisation have solemnly pledged to honour.

"The Security Council believes the economic sanctions are not intended to cause hunger and epidemics among the population of Iraq and Kuwait. This aspect, as we know, was specially discussed at the recent Helsinki meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev and President George Bush. The joint statement they adopted stresses: "The Soviet Union and the United States recognise that Resolution 661 of the U.N. Security Council allows the export of food to Iraq and Kuwait out of humanitarian considerations".

"In this context, the joint statement particularly stressed the role of the committee on sanctions and also the existing international bodies charged with controlling the delivery of food to those for whom it is intended. Proceeding from all these considerations, we favoured the elaboration of a draft resolution, laying down clear-cut internationally-recognised procedures for humanitarian, food and medical deliveries to Iraq and Kuwait.

"We proceeded from the premise that such a document would allow us to settle promptly without any artificial obstacles the concrete problems arising in this connection. Such, for instance, as the case with an Indian ship dispatched to render aid to Indian citizens in Kuwait.

"It is important that the draft devotes special attention to the lot of children and mothers, the sick and the aged, all those who are experiencing particular hardships due to the aggression. This is why the Soviet delegation, which has played an active part in the elaboration of the draft submitted by several countries, has backed this document, which is now known as Resolution 666.

"As to the alternative draft," Vorontsov said, "it contradicts, in our opinion, the spirit, goals and concrete provisions of Security Council Resolution 661, adopted by the majority of Security Council members. This is why the Soviet delegation could not support it."

Training of Iraqi Servicemen in USSR Assessed

LD1509145990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1350 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 15 Sep (TASS)—The Soviet Government has not decided to recall Soviet military specialists from Iraq, just as it has not decided to cease training of Iraqi servicemen in the USSR. This was how a representative of the USSR Ministry of Defense commented in the pages of today's edition of the 'IZVESTIYA' newspaper on the REUTER agency report that the Iraqi servicemen continue to undergo training.

Our position is well known, said the Ministry of Defense representative. We have sharply condemned Iraq's aggression against a neighbouring sovereign state and its occupation. Strictly fulfilling its obligations in connection with the decision adopted by the UN Security Council, the Soviet Union has suspended the supply of military equipment to Iraq.

As regards Soviet military specialists, there are not 190 of them in Iraq, as REUTER insists, but merely 149. They are not taking part in military actions and will return home when their contracts expire or sooner, if anyone wishes. Approximately the same number of Iraqi servicemen are in the USSR.

The group of Iraqi servicemen which REUTER reports on is actually finishing training at the Baltic Fleet training center on the edge of Riga, said a representative of the Ministry of Defense. It consists of two cutter crews, the supply of which to Iraq has been stopped. Their return to Iraq can in no way decisively affect the combat readiness of the country's naval forces. The training program is finishing soon, and in November they should return home.

Incidentally, the Ministry of Defense representative remarked, Iraqi servicemen are training today not only in our country, but also in other countries. In particular, in France, their pilots are undergoing training on Mirage airplanes, and helicopter pilots on Gazelles and Pumas, and in Italy sailors are training.

Commentaries Evaluate Persian Gulf Crisis

'Supremacy of Rule by Fist'

LD1509155390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1310 GMT 15 sep 90

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] On the background of advancement to a new world order the sharp, uncompromising reaction which the adventurism of Iraq's seizure of Kuwait has aroused is understandable. For in essence, with his adventurism, Saddam Husayn has announced the following: All this talk about the end of the cold war does not concern me. I do not give a damn about the appeal by Moscow and Washington to not use armed force to solve political problems. I do not care what is thought, said, or resolved in the United Nations. Iraq is stronger than Kuwait and this decides all.

Such is the logic of Baghdad, and if this is agreed with, if this is not rejected then this means admitting the supremacy of rule by the fist and the preservation of its leading role in international affairs. And this is not just a direct interest; a principle is involved here, and for this reason Gorbachev and Bush's statement in Helsinki was so tough.

On the other hand, this is not just a principle, but interests as well, and for this reason, although the multinational forces there represent around 30 states, it is the Americans who play the decisive, main role in halting aggression there. The United States has taken upon itself the main responsibility and the main risk, and accordingly bears the the main material costs—many billions in costs, it must be said. The United States is a rich country, but nevertheless, the President has turned to the friendly governments of Europe and Asia with a request to join in subsidizing this operation, "Desert Shield." Well, it must be said that Europe has reacted rather coldly to this. Friendship is friendship, but money is something else.

'Secrets' Surround Soviet Role

90UF0531A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 37, 12 Sep 90 p 14

[Article by political commentator Igor Belyayev: "The Secrets That I Would Like Finally To Reveal..."]

[Text] There are many of them concerning the very acute (truly global) explosive military and political crisis in recent years in the Persian Gulf region. Of course, the meeting that has just taken place in Helsinki between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush has clarified the immediate prospects for the development of events. The first statements by its participants to journalists confirm that it was a successful meeting. And of course it could not have been otherwise, because G. Bush needed M.S. Gorbachev's help, while the Soviet Union had an interest in further cooperation with the United States.

The most acute question at the news conference given by M. Gorbachev and G. Bush at the end of the summit meeting in Helsinki was the issue of the possibility of war in the Persian Gulf region. The response was definite: If Iraq complies with the demands of the UN Security Council resolution, that is, withdraws from Kuwait and the legal government of that Arab state is restored, and if all the hostages now held by Saddam Husayn in Iraq and Kuwait are freed, there will be no war. Well, and if the steps now taken do not lead to this, the two superpowers are prepared review the possibility of additional steps in accordance with the UN Charter. And everyone understands what that means....

And one more important conclusion may be drawn from the results of the Helsinki meeting. The United States has been unable on its own to achieve any decisive change in events in the Near East in favor of peace. Nor, incidentally, has the Soviet Union. The guarantee of success lies in joint actions by the international community against aggression, no matter who it is who is guilty of that aggression.

And with respect to the secrets surrounding what happened in the Persian Gulf region before Iraq's attack against Kuwait, it is worth trying to unravel them....

Secret Number One

It is three weeks before the invasion. And as Harvard University professor A. Nekrich now claims, it was exactly then that Colonel General A. Makashov appeared in Baghdad. It turns out, the professor concludes, that the Soviet Union already knew about the Iraqi Army's upcoming massive invasion of Kuwait.

And what did our eminent general do in the Iraqi capital? The essence of A. Nekrich's answer is unambiguous: Colonel General A. Makashov was engaged in consultations about the plan for the Iraqi Army to invade Kuwait. It goes without saying that he was the personal guest of President Saddam Husayn. After a careful review of the plan, General A. Makashov supposedly agreed to it after first making a few amendments....

This flabbergasting news was carried in literally all the newspapers in the world. And the source? Those who asked about it were given a nod in the direction of America.... First the world's telegraph agencies fired off the news, then the newspapers and television, and then the weeklies, sounding alarm and hostility everywhere against the still suspect Soviet Union....

But General A. Makashov was in his own district in both July and August. In his capacity as a military leader his specialty has nothing to do with what the sources in the West reported. He has nothing to do with the General Staff or its strategic services. General A. Makashov simply would not have been sent to Baghdad. And more to the point, no one saw him there....

From whose facile hand did this kind of "news" originate?

Secret Number Two

On the night of 2 August the Iraqi Army invaded Kuwait. Did the CIA know about the upcoming Iraqi invasion? Let me turn to testimony offered by the Americans themselves. I quote from NEWSWEEK, published in New York.

"All associates (of the CIA) were told before the invasion (of Kuwait) that they could go on vacation. You have worked well, men!"

That was the issue for 20 August.

Perhaps NEWSWEEK's statement is unique, just a joke to attract attention? Well no. When, for example, it was necessary to report that President G. Bush had given orders for an operation to destabilize the present regime in Iraq and eliminate Saddam Husayn, this was done by that same weekly. Incidentally, it was very informative with respect to the activities of the American special services....

Did the British Intelligence Service know about Iraq's upcoming crushing invasion of Kuwait? I think that it did. Others might not know, but surely its own people would be very well informed about what was going on in the Persian Gulf region, which had been a relatively recent zone of British interests.

Finally, Jordanian King Husayn and the President of Yemen M. Salih had precise knowledge about Saddam Husayn's intention of swallowing Kuwait. The source of this sensational news was the President of Egypt, Hosni Mubarak!

If all the key intelligence agencies knew about the danger, even if some of them did not, why did they not prevent the invasion?

Secret Number Three

Following Iraqi President Saddam Husayn's statement on the annexation of Kuwait, this is the question that arose: Did the USSR's KGB, or more accurately its intelligence service, know about the upcoming invasion?

Yes, it knew: this is what reliable sources are claiming.

What precisely did it know? It knew that a threat existed. That an invasion might become a fact. That there was a state of readiness for an invasion. On the subject of the date, and even more the hour, of the invasion, opinions differ....

So what about the assertions in the American press that the Soviet Union was almost in control of the Iraqi pyramid of power, and the army, from to top to bottom, as they say? For it is quite obvious that these claims, appearing in particular in extremely authoritative American newspapers, bear no relationship whatsoever to political realities in Iraq. Our diplomats and representative of other departments working in Iraq are operating under extremely harsh conditions. They are not complaining, but they do not feel free in Baghdad.

It has also been claimed—in support of the story about the appearance of General A. Makashov in Baghdad—that on 14 or 16 August the Soviet Union's military attache allegedly reported to Pentagon officials who had received him that all tactical and technical data on Soviet missiles and other Soviet weapons had been delivered to Iraq. And this was reported by solid American newspapers. On whose behalf?

Secret Number Four

Did our military intelligence (the USSR Ministry of Defense Main Intelligence Directorate) know about Iraq's upcoming invasion of Kuwait?

Again, the answer from those same reliable sources is unambiguous: Yes, it did know. However, if we are talking about the day and the hour of the invasion, then in this case there are two differing opinions. Why?

I would like to remind you of something. In those Arab countries in whose armies our military advisers have served (Egypt, for example), in cases where some kind of military action was envisaged they were asked to go to the capital or some city close by. In this kind of case even the senior military adviser was informed of literally nothing that was about to happen. That is what happened in October 1973 before the start of the war with Israel. Do you know why? So that in the event of a victory it would not be shared with those who helped in it. There you have it! It was only when the Egyptian and Syrian armies were forced to retreat under the blows of Israel's armed forces that, in panic, President Sadat appealed to the Soviet Union for help. For none of our advisers were on the banks of the Nile at that time.

Well, with respect to our military specialists working under contract in Iraq (150 are still there!), when the firing started they were not allowed to go near the units of the Iraqi Army....

Nevertheless, why did our generals in Moscow not manage to reacted to the danger that had been signaled in Iraq?

Secret Number Five

Were those in Moscow interested in what our departments were reporting from Baghdad?

Again, this is not a simple question. I think that it is time to say aloud that the level of interest in what is happening in the Near East and the Persian Gulf in particular has recently fallen to a critical point. Look at our mass media. Did the leading newspapers and weeklies, All-Union Radio, or Central Television report on the real situation there before the start of the drama in Kuwait? It is not simply that this was a rare occurrence. In this case we can talk about neglect of what was happening in the Persian Gulf region despite all the alarming signals coming from there. Despite the fact that only Iran separates that region from the Soviet Union.

In recent months we have been focusing on the nuances of Soviet-American relations. Next in terms our priorities of interest was West Europe. The Near East was an irritant in terms of the seemingly eternal Israeli-Arab and Israeli-Palestinian conflicts. There was downright allergy to it. It seemed as if there was nothing to write about it. Even though our interests there are enormous.

And here we must be astonished: That U.S. interests in the Persian Gulf region stand at the top of the scale of American international priorities notwithstanding, G. Bush went on vacation literally immediately before the invasion of Kuwait. Why?

No Secret at All

So who did encourage Saddam Husayn, under whose leadership was Kuwait seized and annexed?

I partially dealt with this question in my last article (LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 35). But it is however necessary to provide an answer. In some of the Western mass media they are still pointing at Moscow and Soviet arms deliveries to Iraq. The truth is the truth. But is it the whole truth?

President R. Reagan and his administration deliberately closed their eyes to the deliveries of French and West European weapons to Iraq. And to the use of chemical weapons there. His administration was reluctant to have Iraq suffer a defeat in the war with its neighbor to the east. In the event that Iraq won, the return of the Americans to Iran would have been guaranteed. In 1984 the United States restored diplomatic relations with Iraq.

On 17 May 1987 two French-made Iraqi air-to-ground missiles damaged the U.S. destroyer Stark. A total of 37 sailors were killed. Washington responded to the attack... against Iran. For the same reason.

Following the restoration of American-Iraqi relations, the United States made a loan to Iraq in order to seal the friendship with Saddam Husayn. For billions of dollars.

In the United States, as in the Soviet Union, insufficient attention was paid to the threatening statement made by Saddam Husayn on 2 April 1990 that he would use chemical weapons against Israel. President G. Bush gave his blessing to a trip (after that statement) made to Baghdad by Republican senators R. Dole and A. Simpson, where they told this to the Iraqi president: "Your problems are with the mass media in the West."

And that was that! But the State Department made every effort to oppose any punishment of Iraq with financial sanctions for human rights violations. It recommended "quiet diplomacy" with the Baghdad regime.

Literally a few days before Iraq's invasion of Kuwait a highly placed State Department spokesman told the journal THE NEW REPUBLIC: "Yes, we see that he (Saddam Husayn) is inclined toward threatening behavior, but we do not consider this a threat...."

That is how it was!

So what are the stakes in the Persian Gulf? I have in mind for the Soviet Union and the West, first and foremost the United States. If we are to talk about immediate interests and possible losses, then it is a question of billions of dollars. If we are talking about the longer-term stakes of countries having legitimate interests there, including the Soviet Union, naturally, then we may be talking about figures ending in dozens of zeros.

It is not, however, just a matter of billions or even trillions. For us, an explosion in the Persian Gulf region would signal the most serious alarm for the security of our southern borders. And within the country. It seems to me that our losing sight of the geopolitical factor is unforgivable, and that on this occasion it should dictate the form of our actions.

And if we remember Saddam Husayn's previous attitude, then alas! his aggressiveness has not been moderated in these last weeks. So we can expect him to do anything.

Saddam Husayn is unpredictable....

Europe 'Cool' Toward Calls for Bigger Gulf Role

PM1409212990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 90 First Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent V. Peresada: "Sensible Approach"]

[Excerpts] Brussels, 14 Sep—"At first glance it might seem that the West is not just reacting but also acting in unison in the conditions of the crisis in the Persian Gulf," THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper writes. "Yet it has to be admitted that this is not so. Elements of an independent policy are emerging in the stances of the United States and its West European partners." [passage omitted]

Washington's request "to spread responsibility" in the Persian Gulf between NATO members was given a cool reception in West European countries. Although this request was expressed by U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker "in the context of a peaceful solution of the conflict," it envisages an increased contribution by Western Europe in support of U.S. military efforts. Including the dispatch to the region of ground force subunits, "albeit symbolic ones," as Baker put it, the provision of air and sea transport facilities for the transfer of U.S. troops, the buildup of naval forces in the Eastern Mediterranean, and so forth. While expressing a formally positive attitude to this request, the West Europeans have sidestepped taking any concrete actions. As M. Woerner, NATO secretary general, expressed it at a press conference, "no decision has been taken." A similar formulation was used as regards financial support by Western Europe for Washington's military measures.

It is interesting to compare the results of this session with the decisions of the "Common Market" conference which was held in Rome. There most of the countries which treated the request "for support to the United States" with reservations in Brussels, expressed willingness to grant financial assistance to Near East countries which are incurring the biggest losses as a result of the embargo on the delivery of goods to Iran. Apart from the diplomatic initiatives, for instance the stepping up of the European-Arab dialogue, the assistance provided in the evacuation of refugees from Iraq and Kuwait, and a number of other humanitarian measures indicate that Western Europe would like to distance itself from excessive military measures in the Persian Gulf and retain its positions in the Near East, the newspaper LIBRE BELGIQUE writes.

Departure of Specialists From Iraq Examined

Specialist Interviewed

90UF0534A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian No 36 Sep 90 p 22

[Interview with Soviet specialist recently departed from Iraq by Vladimir Khovratovich; place and date not given: "We Should Be Getting Out of Iraq Faster"]

[Text] **"We were into day two of our forced wait at Baghdad Airport. The customs officers were imposing the condition: Either take off, leaving all your things here, or 'wait it out.' Finally, following unsuccessful attempts by the Soviet Embassy and Commercial Office to sort out the incident, we headed for the customs inspection. The Iraqi customs services kept their word—they confiscated television sets, tape recorders, video and audio cassettes. The women, and they formed the majority of the flight's passengers, were forced to remove chains and bracelets, and even lipstick was taken away...."**

I was talking with Igor Genrikhovich Danilov. A few hours previously the first flight from Baghdad since 2 August had brought women, children, and a small group of specialists to Moscow.

[Danilov] I am 47 years old. A construction engineer by trade. I had gone to Iraq with the Ministry of Construction for the Southern Regions of the USSR. We were subsequently transferred to the Ministry of Power and Electrification. In Iraq I was a division chief at the construction of the al-Yusifiyah heat and power plant. I came back at my own request—for good. Because when it became a question of pocketbook or life, I opted for the second.

The main thing is to now reassure all relatives here who are worried about the specialists in Iraq. I did some calling yesterday, everyone had wrong information—not what it is actually like there currently. The situation is as yet normal, worse than it was, but the treatment is tolerable. But this is as yet. Because following Gorbachev's statement the attitude toward us began to change abruptly. When we were leaving, there was talk initially about the fact that we would be loading onto the transport aircraft all belongings, women, and children, and a small group of specialists to accompany them. But they refused to admit our belongings to the airport as baggage in the usual way. We were let through the customs inspection, but the customs officers then immediately imposed the condition: Leave just with what you are standing up in, leave the rest in Iraq. Picture the situation: Women and children with belongings which had been earned, and suddenly everything was being taken away. The natural reaction was no, we do not agree to go like this.

We were there until 0300. The next day the order to board once again. We all went 'light.' I left behind a color TV, a radio, and video cassettes. At first the inspection had not been bad, but a new shift took over, and all belongings from the cases were strewn on the floor.

[Khovratovich] Do you think that Gorbachev's statement was premature?

[Danilov] Absolutely. Kurt Waldheim, for instance, came the day before for 88 of his citizens. He spoke with Husayn personally, without making any statements beforehand. But there are 100 times more of our people there!

And all because we think of our people not as individuals but as a factor. But I have to confess that the Iraqi authorities' attitude toward our citizens had been less brutal than toward the Americans, say. But since the statement it is becoming practically the same. Whereas previously, say, the Iraqis would give our campus a miss, today they are strolling about its streets and eying our women. There are a great number of weapons. Boys 12-13 years old are going about unhindered with our Kalashnikovs.

Now, concerning the economic sanctions. Hunger is already setting in, and the food situation is getting very difficult. Practically all trading outlets are closed. Food prices have gone up sharply—five to sevenfold. And these difficulties are disposing ordinary Iraqis against foreign specialists.

[Khovratovich] That is, specialists have found themselves as Husayn's hostages?

[Danilov] Some of our official representatives have said that they would not want to use this term. But I personally believe this to be the case. How otherwise if we have found ourselves in the position of people without any rights. I, for example, was to have gone on leave on 2 August. Until 27 August I had no visa and obtained it only as an escort. And none of the men have been issued one. And only the day before yesterday were 120 of them allowed to leave, those who were working on our contract at the heat and power plant at that.

Who are foreign specialists? They are, after all, the missionaries of the 20th Century. They bring with them new technology. Some things they build, some things they sell. Husayn is using them barbarously for his own political ends. There should be no forgiveness for him for this.

We should be getting out of Iraq as quickly as possible. Were an Il-86 to be sent daily, not only the women and children but all specialists also could be brought out on a few flights.

[Khovratovich] But who believes that not everyone should be taken out: Iraq or our authorities?

[Danilov] I do not know for sure, but our specialists are being told: "Nothing to worry about. Continue working on your contracts as you were." I do not understand who needs such contracts in wartime. No one, in my opinion, and there is no economic benefit to be had from them.

[Khovratovich] Recall how it all began. I mean 2 August.

[Danilov] Even before the start of the events, war hysteria was being fanned practically the whole time I was there.

It is paradoxical, but I was to have flown out on leave on precisely 2 August. However, right up to 27 August we did not know who we were—vacationers, refugees, or hostages.

The situation we were in was very strange. No one was shooting, nothing was being dropped on us. There was nothing that was frightening. But imagine the situation when you are told: "You stay in this room, we will give you food and drink and all conveniences, but we are locking you up." I therefore understand those foreigners who crossed the desert to the Jordanian border to escape from Iraq as quickly as possible.

And no one from the embassy came and said, what is more: "All is calm. You are safe, we are monitoring the situation and will stand by you." The only thing we were told was: "Work!" What would happen in the future, what kind of situation we would be in, no one knew. The Americans officially considered their citizen hostages and pursued the appropriate policy. Which policy? One fact: Immediately following the start of military operations, they ceased all construction and undertook the evacuation of their citizens. Awaiting the American specialists upon arrival in the United States is, naturally, material and, which is for us something exotic altogether, moral compensation. You understand, of course, that we could not even dream of this.

However unpleasant, I would like to also mention how we were greeted in Moscow. Truly, out of the frying pan into the fire.

The reception at Sheremetyevo-1 was a shock in the worst sense. Aeroflot told us that we would get our belongings at 1500 (we had arrived at 0500). There were no baggage handlers. And we had flown into an airport, what is more, which is totally unadapted for incoming flights from overseas. A group was organized from those meeting the arrivals and us specialists which unloaded the suitcases. There were no baggage carts. A further shock was that American television crews met us right as we stepped off the aircraft. There was no one there from our press. In addition, I was approached in the airport building by an employee of the Ministry for Foreign Economic Relations, who inquired: "What happened, why was the flight delayed" (I have to confirm the ministry official's doubts—I had been calling there and the Ministry of Civil Aviation the whole day, 27 August, but I was given no precise time of arrival—V.Kh.). He was the only official among those greeting the arrivals. No more were necessary. Insulting.

And how were we greeted at the hotel? Women and children had been without sleep for 48 hours. But the administrator said that he would not accommodate us until we each submitted an application individually. Just so.

Said To Face Dangers in Iraq

LD1609083490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Text] [Unidentified announcer] You know, I would like to express my opinion. I have been mainly concerned by information that in the opinion of many Turkish commentators, military actions will begin in any event. So today information agencies have reported there are nuclear weapons aboard American aircraft carriers. And so I—as a Soviet man—am concerned most of all with what will happen to Soviet specialists in Iraq. Despite the Soviet Union Ministry of Defense and Ministry of Foreign Affairs statement on the safety of our specialists, I think that this is far from being the case. And this is why. If Americans and British people are located near such so-called strategic establishments—they are being called a living shield—then I, judging from my own experience since I spent four years in Iraq, know that our specialists actually live on the territory of these establishments. And if the worst scenario of developments in the Persian Gulf comes about, then they could become victims of the conflict.

Many consider that only military establishments are strategic, but everyone knows that during military actions any industrial establishment is military as well, and this means heat and electric stations, water engineering schemes, factories, the oil industry. It is probably for this very reason that a number of USSR Supreme Soviet people's deputies have raised the question of the immediate evacuation of all specialists from Iraq. It is difficult to imagine the reasons why the specialists remain, but from my experience I know that our country could lose a certain amount of hard currency by breaking contracts. But the fact is that if this suspension is unilateral, then we lose. But it is time to base ourselves on values common to mankind, and not put departmental, and even hard currency, interests above the life of each individual.

Reports, Comments on U.S. Role in Persian Gulf

Bush's Iraqi TV Address Noted

LD1709055390 Moscow TASS in English 0541 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Washington September 17 TASS—President George Bush delivered a short address to the Iraqi people over Baghdad Television on Sunday [16 September]. The President's speech was videotaped in the White House's Oval Office on Wednesday.

"The Iraqi leadership has miscalculated. Once again, the Iraqi people face tragedy. Today, opposed by world opinion, Iraq stands isolated and alone," the President said.

"When President Gorbachev and I met at Helsinki we agreed that no peaceful international order is possible if larger states can devour their neighbours," he continued.

"In fact, the occupation of Kuwait is helping no one and is now hurting you, the Iraqi people," Bush said, addressing the Iraqi people.

Noting that the Iraqi aggression can lead to war, the President stressed: "as Americans, we're slow to raise our hand in disputes. But when we have exhausted every alternative, when conflict is thrust upon us, there is no nation on earth with greater resolve or stronger steadiness of purpose".

For the sake of the Iraqi people, "Iraq must withdraw from Kuwait," Bush concluded.

Iran May Support Baghdad

PM1409145590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Sep 90 First Edition p 5

[Article by Yu. Subbotin under the rubric "Around Events in the Persian Gulf": "The Expensive 'Cheap' Oil"]

[Text] A new and quite substantial factor is evidently coming into play in the "war of nerves" which is still going on along the Persian Gulf's shores. Iran has issued a firm warning that it could take Iraq's side. Ayatollah Khamene'i, leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, has called on the Muslim countries to wage a "holy war" against the United States, aimed at forcing the U.S. Armed Forces to withdraw from Saudi Arabia where Islam's holiest shrines are situated.

The immediate future will show whether Teheran will carry out its threat to back Baghdad and, if yes, what form it will take. But the very fact of this statement by the region's largest state, which moreover fought a most bloody war against Iraq for eight years and is fully justified in feeling unsympathetic toward it, must be an alarming signal for the United States and its closest allies. This is more than just a question of Iran's potential and its influence as a regional power. This country is the recognized center of the Shi'a stream in Islam. And the Americans are banking to a considerable extent on a possible confrontation and intercommunal dissension, capable of breaking the country apart internally, between the Shi'ites who make up the majority of Iraq's population, and its predominantly Sunni leadership. Even a purely moral backing of Baghdad by Teheran would substantially diminish the likelihood of such a development of events.

But why is Teheran leaning toward its long-standing rival, whose rout or at least weakening it should be passionately desiring according to the simplest rules of logic? The point is probably not only and not so much the exchange of prisoners of war and the territorial concessions by Iraq, even though this step by Baghdad in the current situation appears highly sensible and effective. In response, however, Iran was in no hurry to back the annexation of Kuwait. And it now appears that the issue does not concern this at all. The issue concerns possible support for Iraq as a country opposing the growing foreign presence in the region. And if the West continues the buildup of its forces there and its saber-rattling, such support will be inevitably expanded, since it is becoming increasingly obvious that the goals and scale of this buildup are clearly extending beyond the narrow framework of the officially proclaimed protection of Saudi Arabia's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Recent statements by U.S. Secretary of Defense R. Cheney leave hardly any doubts in this regard. He stated in an interview with U.S. television companies that, in the event of offensive operations being started against Iraq, combat actions will be commanded exclusively by Americans and Saudi Arabia will not have the right to veto such operations. The minister announced in the same interview that the United States does not rule out "permanent ground presence in the Near East."

It is well known that weapons which appear on the stage will have to be fired sooner or later. Americans themselves are increasingly worried by such fears. The opinion poll data now published in the United States, showing widespread support for President G. Bush's actions on the economic isolation of Iraq and his decisions to send troops to Saudi Arabia, do not at all mean that the Americans are eager to fight.

There was wide response, for example, to an open letter to G. Bush, published by THE NEW YORK TIMES, from University of Wisconsin Professor Alex Molnar whose son, a marine, was sent to Saudi Arabia together with other U.S. soldiers. A. Molnar calls on the U.S. Administration not to resort to military force but to find a diplomatic solution for settling the crisis. "I would not like," the letter's author emphasizes, "my son and his peers to die for cheap oil."

This is by no means a voice in the wilderness. S. Nunn, one of the most influential U.S. legislators, who heads the Senate Armed Services Committee, stated that it is time to slow down the buildup of U.S. military might in the Near East. Warnings about the catastrophic consequences of a large-scale military clash with Iraq have been issued by former U.S. President J. Carter and by Z. Brzezinski, a politician who certainly cannot be classed as a "dove."

But there are also some highly influential forces pushing the U.S. President onto the "war path." In these conditions, it is exceptionally important to really adhere to the provision of the Soviet-U.S. Joint Statement, made by the two countries' leaders in Helsinki, about the priority of peaceful means for settling the crisis.

Impact on U.S. Policy Examined

PM1709090890 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel M. Ponomarev under the rubric "Military Commentator's Viewpoint": "When the 'Cold War' Ended"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Analyzing the changes that were emerging in U.S. military policy in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in spring this year, I wrote that the policy would depend to a very large extent on how various actions by Moscow were interpreted and assessed in Washington. The predictability of Soviet foreign policy cannot but be an extremely important factor for stability in today's world.

This indeed turned out to be the case. In a situation where the "cold war" has ended, the United States is conducting a major review of its military policy and strategy. This review has now entered its final stage. The conclusions which the U.S National Security Council, Defense Department, and Joint Chiefs of Staff finally reached were expounded the other day in a detailed statement by the chief of the Pentagon at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in Homestead (Virginia).

To attempt to sum up all that R. Cheney said, the essence of Washington's new military policy and strategy can be reduced to the following.

U.S. postwar strategy was based above all on the necessity of dealing with the steady growth of Soviet military might, and with Moscow's willingness to use this might. The United States, for its part, formed a system of military alliances aimed against the USSR and deployed large military forces. "In the last 40 years the structure of our forces, the procedure of their deployment, and our strategy have to a significant degree been based on the need to be prepared for a world war with the Soviet Union at short notice," the defense secretary said. "We were guided by our plans for conducting a major land war in Europe." And, he modestly added, they relied on the support of strategic nuclear forces "for deterrence." All this, as is well known, was given concrete form in strategic doctrines like "massive retribution," "mutually assured destruction," "direct confrontation," and "flexible response," and in the concepts of one-and-a-half and even two-and-a-half wars.

Now the situation has radically altered. The Soviets (I am using Cheney's terms) are withdrawing their troops from Eastern Europe, significant political and economic transformations are being carried out in the USSR, the "cold war" has become a thing of the past, and real improvements have taken place in U.S.-Soviet relations. In these circumstances, Washington has come to the conclusion that the main idea of U.S. strategy must be not to ensure readiness for a nuclear world war with the USSR at short notice, but to concentrate its main attention on regional conflicts and crises. In this connection, it is noted that the United States no longer needs Armed Forces of the size and combat readiness that were built up in past years.

However, the new strategy proceeds on the basis that support should be maintained for U.S. forces deployed on the forward borders in Asia, the Pacific, and other areas of the globe, and also for large forces in Europe, albeit on a lower level there than has hitherto been the case. At the same time there should be certain forces in the United States itself destined for use in emergencies in order to support the troops stationed on the forward borders and conserve the strategic potential.

This is the gist of the new U.S. strategy, expressed in the most concise form, naturally. How should it be assessed? Of course, it is much more realistic compared with the concepts the Pentagon has followed in previous years. Though the idea of "nuclear deterrence" is retained in the subtext, there are no longer direct references to the "Soviet military threat," by which the United States' large-scale militarist preparations and its pretensions to world hegemony were until recently justified.

All this is, of course, important and interesting. But here is a curious fact. The new U.S. strategy is for the time being still at the stage of elaboration—advanced elaboration, it is true. But life has already cast a severe test in its direction. And here we have to return once again to the crisis in the Persian Gulf—one of those very regional conflicts to which so much attention is devoted in Washington.

At the beginning of this crisis, the Americans did not have large forces in the region. Only a few warships in the Arabian Sea and the Persian Gulf. But, responding to Saudi Arabia's request for protection from Iraq's aggressive encroachments, in a little over a month they managed to concentrate a grouping here of more than 100,000 men, hundreds of planes, and some 60 ships, mainly drawn from those very forces deployed in the United States which are destined for operations in emergencies—the 82d Airborne Division, the 24th Mechanized Division, some marine expeditionary corps brigades, and units of the 1st Armored Division and the 101st Air Assault Division. So that we have grounds to say that to a certain degree the new strategy is already operating.

However, there is also another side to the matter. The crisis in the Persian Gulf zone has led to the Americans going back on a number of their initiatives in the sphere of military organization. Demands for a reduction in the military budget are no longer heard, and plans to reduce the Armed Forces and reject a number of military-technical programs have been put aside. The military policy which only recently was, figuratively speaking, fighting rearguard actions in the Washington corridors of power, is once again riding triumphantly in the van. And once again voices have begun to be heard saying that the destiny of the world must be decided by a strong America.

Yes, we share the American determination to bring about an end to Iraqi aggression, and if the measures now being undertaken do not lead to this, we are prepared to examine the possibility of additional steps in accordance with the UN Charter. But today, no country, however powerful it may be, can provide the world leadership which some people are not adverse to claiming. Faint echoes of these pretensions can be heard even in the long-term military policy and military strategy, the elaboration of which is now being completed in Washington.

It is not just the "cold war" that is over. As the results of the Moscow meeting on questions of the German settlement show, the entire postwar period has come to an end. Mankind is entering on an era of peace. And this is the basis on which one ought to proceed.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Settlement of Angolan Conflict Examined

Arms to Rebels Said To Bar Peace

PM1409131790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent M. Pavlov: "Growing Interference"]

[Text] Luanda—Since the recent, fruitless third round of talks between representatives of the Angolan Government and the UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] organization to bring peace to the country, there have been growing calls for the Soviet Union and the United States to become actively involved in the settlement process.

Jean Gervais, Ivory Coast ambassador to Angola and dean of the foreign diplomatic corps, has said that his government takes a positive attitude to the proposal of any initiative capable of bringing the warring sides' positions closer together, regardless of the origin of these initiatives. But the two great powers can make the greatest contribution to the task of ending the war in Angola.

It would seem that everything is straightforward and that all that remains to be done is to act—especially as, according to reports, both the Soviet Union and the United States already have their "teams" ready and prepared. In that case, observers ask in bewilderment, why can we not feel their influence on the talks, which the Angolan and UNITA leaders cannot bring out of deadlock? Obviously it is not all down to Moscow and Washington, because the degree of their involvement in the settlement process is determined by the framework drawn by the opposing sides.

The stand taken by Zaire and the RSA [Republic of South Africa] in support of UNITA is still a serious impediment to peace. Reports from Pretoria say that, henceforth, regular flights by the RSA airline, South African Airways, between Johannesburg and Lumumbashi (Zaire) will be used to transport military equipment, food supplies, and medicines to the RSA and, from there, to southern Angola for UNITA. One senior airline employee confirmed that their aircraft are intended mainly for freight transportation and only for a handful of passengers. Moreover, Zairian sources quoted by the RSA Information Agency, ANO, feel that there is a perfectly real possibility of shipping military supplies to UNITA in this way. This means that Lumumbashi is becoming a staging post for equipment needed by the Savimbi group; this equipment's first port of call is the military base at Kamina, also used by the United States for this purpose. Another serious source of concern for the Angolan leadership is the arrival of two RSA Navy ships in the Zairian port of Matadi. Considering that this port is being used to supply UNITA with weapons, specialists cannot rule out the possibility that these ships could also be used for the same purpose.

Observers believe that the actions of Zaire and the RSA are being coordinated and directed by certain forces in the United States which plan to secure Congressional approval for extra aid to UNITA. Savimbi is planning to go to Washington to secure this extra aid. So is it realistic in this situation to hope that peace will soon come to Angola?

A recent session of the Angolan National People's Assembly condemned the constant interference by the United States, Zaire, and the RSA in the republic's internal affairs and demanded that it be stopped. At the same time, Angolan parliamentarians appealed to their colleagues in the aforementioned countries to prohibit their governments from giving military aid to UNITA, as this aid is being used by the group to destroy economic installations and kill innocent people. If this appeal goes unheeded, the fourth round of talks between the Angolan government and UNITA—planned for the second half of September—will not stop the continuing bloodshed.

Anglolan-South African Ties Eyed

MB1709125990 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Commentary by Yelena Olgina—read by announcer]

[Text] A four-sided commission monitoring action on the peace settlement in southwest Africa has met in session in Windhoek. Yelena Olgina comments:

As it was generally expected no significant problems arose at the session in Windhoek. Credit for that is due mainly to Cuba and Angola. The Cuban troops are being pulled out of Angola even a little ahead of schedule.

It was stated at the session that peace was out of the question in southwest Africa if there is no peace in the south of the African continent. That is why attention was focused on the situation in Angola. In a changed position with regard to aid to UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] is apparently a snag in the peace talks between MPLA [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola] and UNITA and creates additional tensions in the region [sentence as heard].

This year, United States' aid to UNITA will reach $80 million. This was nothing but crude pressure on the legitimate Government of Angola. In Windhoek, Herman Cohen had a chance to discuss this issue with the Angolan delegates and I would like to hope their contacts were useful.

As regards Angolan-South African contacts, the sides decided from here on to iron out any and all complications directly, [words indistinct] communication provides ample opportunity for that for without such direct contacts, mutual trust is out of the question.

[Words indistinct] is the recent call of two South African military vessels at port Matadi, in Zaire. The reaction in Luanda was not ambiguous. South Africa is still extending UNITA assistance via Zaire. The situation in Angola is very tense and a possibility of an agreement between UNITA and MPLA is still very problematic. (?It is best) not to aggravate the situation and all the sides the concerned must be extremely responsible about what they do and say.

I would liked to hope that the session in Windhoek will promote the talks between MPLA and UNITA. A fourth round has been set for 24 September. No doubt the Soviet and American delegations have had an opportunity to get their bearings on the question of mediatorship in an internal Angolan settlement and we will also learn what decisions Moscow and Washington have made.

The later session of the commission was very useful and proved that negotiations are becoming routine in settling complicated matters on the continent.

South African Unrest, Opposition Reviewed

MB1609161490 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Commentary by Aleksandr Fedorov—read by announcer]

[Text] I could be mistaken, but it seems to me the situation in South Africa is critical at present. Of course, if one remembers the tragic statistics of the past years and of casualties, it is not that big. Such estimates are hardly appropriate, though, as it is not possible to (?dictate) the time or the events.

Beginning with 1976 the situation in the country has been absolutely clear. With rare exceptions, the supporters of the conflicting camps were also clear. Only with the exception of the stand of the ultra-right wing, everybody claims they want changes, constitutional, social, or changes in relations between people. Against this background there is bitter fighting among those in whose interest the changes are to be carried out, the changes to abolish apartheid.

I was interested to [word indistinct] how some South Africans could [word indistinct] this daily, hourly hostility, which sometimes is going without any sort of (?applied) motive. After all, Eugene Terreblanch's reasoning that Africans are aggressive by nature simply does not hold water.

The editor of the South African newspaper BUSINESS DAY, who was recently in the Soviet Union, in replying to a question about this, said the African National Congress [ANC] wants to take power. It began by doing away with possible opponents who don't want to join the ANC. I don't think that a similar point of view predominates elsewhere in South Africa, because other people who have been coming to Radio Moscow have pointed out that in South Africa there are forces who are interested in the failure of President de Klerk's reforms.

Representatives of those forces who have been spotted taking part in recent clashes between the Xhosa and the Zulus are opponents in the Army and in the police, because the [word indistinct] believes that the (?president's) action has pushed them into the background. It seems that their passions are being stirred by those standing in the shadows.

I think the Nationalist Party was guided by good intentions when it opened its doors to all who wanted to join, including Africans, but it was scarcely to the best of (?interest) for those party [word indistinct] who proposed to include, in the organization, practically the full membership of Inkatha. As is well known, it has been charged with attacks on the ANC and with [word indistinct] ethnic conflicts.

A highly dangerous, deliberate preference for some African liberation organizations, in my opinion, is well understood by delegates at the recent Democratic Party conference. At the conference there was a call to establish closer ties with the ANC, and was not [word indistinct] the Nationalists, by setting up an alliance with Inkatha. This point of view was not supported by the majority at the conference. The delegates were sure that any confrontation will complicate the settlement process. At a [word indistinct] an alliance around the ANC and Inkatha could be seen as purely [word indistinct] party (?gains) by the Nationalists and Democrats. But, it is necessary to pay attention to all the difficulties in the present situation in South Africa.

South African political experts feel that one of the reasons for the ANC's militancy is [words indistinct] of millions of Africans. Constantly one hears from Inkatha that their organization was being pushed into the background at the present talks on the constitutional reform. Therefore, they use any excuse to demonstrate the people's support for Inkatha.

Judging by reports coming from South Africa, the government and the opposition parties fully understand the difficult situation. And there is hope that in those conditions any [word indistinct] to [word indistinct] apartheid will be suppressed.

Ethiopian Opposition Group Threatens Secession

EA1509222090 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Commentart by Vladimir Borisov]

[Text] The self-styled opposition group, the Eritrean People's Liberation Front [EPFL], is preparing to start an offensive to capture the Eritrean capital, Asmera. According to foreign diplomats in Addis Ababa, the fighting between the central government of Ethiopia and the secessionists has reached its climax. Here is a commentary on this issue by our observer, Vladimir Borisov.

The offensive that is expected to start soon after the end of the long rains will be of great political significance. The EPLF has almost all of Eritrea under its control. This coupled with the victories they are winning in the battles fought against the demoralized regular army will give them more courage in their endeavors, says the observer. However can we say that the fighting has reached its climax? If Asmera is captured and Eritrea declares its independence, can it be said that one of the many problems that has crippled today's Ethiopia has been solved? It is foolish to believe that this regional conflict, which is one the bloodiest and longest in Africa, can be solved like this.

Since the central government has already declared war, it is simply unbelievable that this would produce a solution. The slogan to the effect that the Red Sea shall always remain as our border, which was being echoed in Addis Ababa during the revolution anniversary celebration, is a manifestation of this fact. The war for control of Eritrea has greater political meaning than currently believed and might take on an international character, says Vladimir Borisov.

This does not mean that when the Eritreans receive more assistance from the Arab world; Addis Ababa will be getting more from Israel and will continue to benefit from its improved relations with the United States. On the contrary, it means that the situation might threaten the security of all of Africa, because the threat of Eritrea seceding from the rest of Ethiopia is becoming more evident and clear. This situation reminds us of Biafra, Cabinda, and several other territorial claims by many African countries. The OAU Charter's provisions concerning the inviolability of the borders demarcated at the time of independence are still firm. In fact there are times when this charter has been challenged in the past 30 years. What will be the outcome if those who want to follow in Eritrea's footsteps take up arms in a bid to abrogate the principle? What is the way out of this problem?

While the Ethiopian Government, which faces great problems, advocates resuming dialogue in the presence of international observers, the EPLF secessionists, who are encouraged by their successful battles, do not seem to see the need for such a dialogue or a referendum. Their current objective is struggle until final victory, but Vladimir Borisov says final victory is elusive in such a bloody civil war.

Observers say that if the war continues it will cause the collapse of Mengistu Haile Mariam's regime. Both the Sha'biyyah [EPLF] and Tigray Weyane [Tigre People's Liberation Front] share this same belief and sentiment. The Weyane in particular have officially supported the secession of Eritrea from Ethiopia.

No matter what type of regime is in power in Addis Ababa, its stand will definitely bring confusion and conflict. The current issue here is unity, which is a determining factor for the existence of the nation and the government, and not replacing unfavorable leaders with others. While sovereignty and territorial integrity are paramount, it should not appear as a last card for political gambling, concludes our observer.

Yanayev Receives Zimbabwean Politburo Member

LD1409220790 Moscow TASS in English 2106 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 15 TASS—Politburo member Gennadiy Yanayev, who is also a secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, met a delegation from the African National Union of Zimbabwe - Patriotic Front led by Politburo Member J. Nkomo on Friday.

They had a friendly talk on the activity of the Soviet Communist Party and the African National Union - Patriotic Front and prospects for future bilateral relations. The two sides touched upon international issues including the situation in the South of Africa.

East Europe

'Expert' Discusses East Europe Economic Reform

AU1209112390 Prague HOSPODARSKE NOVINY in Czech 7 Sep 90 p 5

[Interview with Academician Oleg Bogomolov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics of the World Socialist System Institute, by Milos Sklenka and Josef Vratislav in Prague; date not given: "It Is Unnecessary To Design Clothes For a Person Who Is No Longer Alive"]

[Text] The course of economic reform and the search for methods of converting the economies of countries belonging to the former East bloc to market principles—as well as the future of economic relations between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union—are today at the center of our public's attention. We took the opportunity of asking Oleg Bogomolov, the well-known Soviet expert and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics of the World Socialist System Institute, for an interview during his visit to Prague.

[HOSPODARSKE NOVINY] Unlike in East European countries, the idea of singular economic reform does not enjoy general political support in the USSR. Even the notion of singular reform does not exist. At the same time, it is desirable for the whole federation to have unified reform. What is the best way out of this vicious circle?

[Bogomolov] The fact that in my country there are various views about the method of reform and about the conversion to a market economy is, in my opinion, absolutely normal. I do not see any danger in this from the point of view of its eventual success. After all, fundamental changes are taking place in all spheres of social life in the USSR. However, it is disturbing that, to date, we cannot talk about a unified stance adopted by the government, the president, and the individual republics. So far, there is no completely clear idea about what our country will look like in the future. However, one thing is already obvious today—in place of a unitary state with a strongly centralized system and a minimum of authority for the individual republics, a new state—where the influence of the center will be significantly limited—will be established.

[HOSPODARSKE NOVINY] In the USSR work is currently being completed on the preparations for economic reform, which parliament should approve in September. In this connection, there is also an increase in activity in the individual republics which are preparing their own version of converting to a market economy, for example, the Yeltsin Plan which was drafted for 500 days. In your opinion, which of the prepared plans has the best chance of being approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet and why?

[Bogomolov] President Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet, decided to set up a joint group of experts which—on the basis of the Russian Government's plan for converting to a market economy, the so-called "platform for 500 days"—will attempt to draw up a variant for converting our economy which is acceptable to the whole of society. Problems have arisen in issues such as the method for privatizing state property, maintaining a financial equilibrium, demonopolizing industry—which today is monopolized to such a level that there is practically no competition on the domestic market—the further reform of the banking system, policy in the area of price formation, the means of socially protecting citizens, and so on. When the aims and contents of the government plan are compared with B. Yeltsin's platform, it is obvious that the Russian Government's plan is much more radical, although even this is not the optimum one under today's conditions. However, opposed to the proposal put forward by Premier N. Ryzhkov, it envisages a considerable division of authority between the center and the republics which, in the case of the market economy, is a fundamental prerequisite for its operation. It seems to me that our government has "designed" clothes for a person who is no longer alive.

[HOSPODARSKE NOVINY] Regardless of which version is adopted, what kind of general obstacles do you consider to be most serious for the reform effort in view of the state of the economy and social awareness, habits, working morale, and so on?

[Bogomolov] There are many obstacles and barriers. From a historical viewpoint, a great disproportion has been formed in our national economy between the industrial branches—which produce technology, machinery, equipment, and so on—and those which satisfy an individual's fundamental needs—agriculture, light industry, and the food industry. The share of the net national product in the USSR's national income is one of the lowest in the world. Therefore, it is absolutely logical that this situation cannot be changed from day to day. At the same time, this situation also slows down the attempt to develop a material stimulus with the aim of increasing the social productivity of labor. It is also obvious that, in view of the absence of a sufficient number of consumer goods on the domestic market, there is an actual depreciation in the population's salaries and deposits as a consequence of the growth in inflation. However, there are also obstacles which we create ourselves and which result from inexperience and an ignorance of the regular operation—and the very essence of the operation—of a market economy. I would say that these are barriers more of a psychological nature conditioned by the inertia of the ideological thinking both of managers and apparatchiks and the population, which today is still not prepared for life and work under completely new market conditions. The overwhelming majority of our people are not used to owning anything—they live, in essence, on their wages and their personal property is comprised of furniture and clothing. First of all, it is necessary to cultivate in them a corresponding attitude toward new forms of ownership.

[HOSPODARSKE NOVINY] In connection with converting the economy to market principles, a draft plan for the population's social security has been drawn up in the USSR. Could you characterize it briefly?

[Bogomolov] I should admit that I was rather surprised when I found out about this plan from the newspapers. A paradoxical situation develops when the precise aims of future economic reform are still unknown—reform which, moreover, has not even been approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet—and when protection from its negative effects has already been drafted. This means that the plan for the population's effective security, which you are talking about, proceeds from the premise that the original government program reckoning with an administrative increase in prices by 200-300 percent will be adopted by the Soviet parliament. However, so far, no one has agreed to price increases and, in my opinion, parliament will not approve this step. I think it is now necessary to drain "hot" money from the population by completely different means. I have in mind selling off state property to the people; this way completely new markets would be created in our country—for houses, apartments, land, shares, and so on. This same way we could significantly reduce the volume of "surplus" money so that the demand for consumer goods on the domestic market would essentially decline.

[HOSPODARSKE NOVINY] Today CEMA is also facing fundamental reform in its relationships. The GDR is already practically a member of the West European integration, although it wants to continue to maintain its ties with the Council's countries. Other East European countries, including Czechoslovakia, are interested in membership of—or, at least, an affiliation to—the EC. In this connection, do you think it makes sense to attempt to revitalize CEMA, or rather, to establish a functioning integrative grouping in East Europe?

[Bogomolov] CEMA is today experiencing a very difficult crisis which, however, it could have been possible to foresee to a certain extent and, in my opinion, to at least partially moderate its consequences. Unfortunately, however, this did not happen. The crisis was caused not only by the complicated situation in the USSR, but also by the situation in individual member countries. The evolution of this crisis was conditioned especially by the fact that the methods for the administrative-command system of managing the economy were not tried and tested in practice. A complicated situation arose for the states of Central and East Europe when the old economic and commercial relations within the CEMA framework started to collapse and when the new ones—I have in mind those with the EC countries—began to evolve slowly and with difficulty. For this reason, I think it is necessary to again consider at the national government level all possibilities for continuing cooperation within the Council's framework. Of course, on completely new foundations and principles, I think this would be in the interest of overall cooperation between East and West.

[HOSPODARSKE NOVINY] Our mutual economic and commercial relations are also facing fundamental changes today. The transfer to world prices and convertible currency in general will not be simple. This is to take place as of 1 January 1991. Do you consider this to be a realistic date in view of the chronic lack of convertible currency in both countries?

[Bogomolov] This date is only one aspect of the matter which, moreover, neither myself nor you can in any way influence. Now, it is necessary to find a course of action that would minimize the negative impact of the newly developed situation on individual CEMA countries. It is essential to draw up an effective system to compensate for losses. After all, if the USSR is your debtor today, the situation could be different in a couple of years. For example, it could be possible to utilize the current Czechoslovak active balance to gradually cover the deficit that will inevitably arise during the transition to world prices and accounting in freely convertible currencies. The Soviet Union has already agreed on such a course of action with Hungary. However, there are also possibilities here for accounting on the basis of so-called clearing with a convertible balance. However, in view of the fact that not one CEMA country has a sufficient supply of freely convertible currency, it would be necessary to acquire credit in the West with the aim of guaranteeing this system's operation. I think the West would support this proposal.

[HOSPODARSKE NOVINY] The Soviet Union is still very important for our economy and there is no doubt that it will continue to be important for a number of reasons. However, the main issue is that cooperation is truly advantageous for both sides and that each side adheres to its obligations. I think that under such conditions there should not be a significant reduction in mutual trade. What do you think?

[Bogomolov] I think sufficiently large scope is now being created for establishing or concluding commercial agreements with the individual republics directly, for example, with Russia, the Ukraine, and the Baltic states. In my opinion, there are also new possibilities here for commercial relations at the enterprise level. Let us say for supplies of oil, which Czechoslovakia is interested in. The Czechoslovak side could pay for oil supplies, which would be extracted over and above the plan, by supplying consumer goods directly to the employees in the extraction plants or by constructing apartments for which there is a huge demand. After all, only 40 percent of mutual commercial exchange will be regulated at a central level; 60 percent will be implemented at the enterprise level. I would like to stress once again that the USSR has a genuine interest in developing economic cooperation with Czechoslovakia. It is necessary to seek a new form for our mutual relations. In this connection, I would like to say that I am not convinced that today we can guarantee you supplies of specific goods as a state. This would be contrary to the very essence of the market. If the state were to take these obligations on itself it would slow down its own conversion to the market and would again be practically telling the enterprises what and how much to produce. In my opinion, the nucleus of the entire problem is contained in this.

[HOSPODARSKE NOVINY] Great changes will perhaps take place in the commodities exchanged in mutual trade. Which spheres of exchange, or types of goods, do you consider to be the most promising?

[Bogomolov] I think your commercial strategy should be oriented, first and foremost, toward those spheres which satisfy people's fundamental needs. We need to construct a far more efficient agriculture system, to establish small farms with the corresponding technology, to change the production base of light industry, and to modernize the transportation, storage, processing industry, and telecommunication spheres. A huge demand will inevitably be created in these branches under the new conditions which will also open up new opportunities for Czechoslovak producers and suppliers.

[HOSPODARSKE NOVINY] I do not doubt that you are very carefully following the course of reform, or the preparations for it, in other countries. In your opinion, what prospects do the individual countries have for being successful within the time frame they have adopted?

[Bogomolov] This is a complicated question and there is perhaps no unequivocal answer to it, although the aims are the same, the methods applied and the experience gained are different. Recent practice has indicated that, to date, Poland and Yugoslavia have best of all dealt with the fundamental prerequisites for converting to the market; I have in mind convertibility and stabilizing the domestic currency, supplying the domestic market, and reducing inflation. However, production has also declined significantly in both countries. Apart from this, in Poland there have recently been more and more graphic manifestations of political instability which undermines the success of the adopted reform steps. Moreover, the main thing—privatization—has so far not begun in the process for transforming the Polish economy. In Yugoslavia the situation has been completely different from the very beginning; I would say it has been better. A lower foreign debt, a better supplied market, and so on. Overall, I see bright prospects for that country and I think the transformation process will be quicker there than in the other countries. The GDR is a special, but useful, example. East German changes are a source of experience particularly in issues such as privatization, unemployment, wage differentiation, and so on. The Hungarian Government has elected a step by step version for its transformation and is convinced that this is the best road toward the market. In essence, this is the direct opposite of the course of action selected by

Poland. As far as Czechoslovakia is concerned, I have to say that your country—from a time point of view—is lagging a little behind Hungary and Poland; however, on the other hand, as opposed to them it has a far smaller foreign debt and a substantially better supplied domestic market. The condition of the state budget also creates positive prerequisites for a stable financial system and for introducing the internal convertibility of the Czechoslovak koruna as of next year. I think Czechoslovakia has good starting conditions for the successful transformation of its economy to market principles, but it is necessary to resolve the privatization of state property as quickly as possible.

Lukyanov Receives Hungarian Envoy for Talks

LD1409223290 Budapest MTI in English 2044 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, September 14 (MTI)—The sweeping changes taking place in Hungary and the Soviet Union have an obvious impact on bilateral relations. Under such circumstances, the Soviet leadership seeks to build on its positive elements, Anatoliy Lukyanov, president of the Supreme Soviet, told Sandor Gyorke, ambassador of the Republic of Hungary to the Soviet Union, on Friday.

The meeting was initiated by the Hungarian diplomat.

Gyorke presented a letter to Anatoliy Lukyanov, in which Gyorgy Szabad, speaker of the Hungarian parliament, expressed thanks for the congratulations he had received from Lukyanov on the occasion of his election. The Hungarian ambassador handed over a similar letter, addressed by Arpad Goncz, president of the Republic of Hungary, to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

The meeting gave a chance to survey Hungarian-Soviet relations. The Hungarian ambassador told the Moscow correspondent of MTI that Lukyanov stressed the need to preserve the positive features of the relationship and thus strengthening co-operation and good relations.

In view of the new circumstances, inter-parliamentary co-operation will be given a new role within inter-state relations, Lukyanov said. He told the ambassador that the Soviet parliament had received the Hungarian parliament's resolution on the events of 1956 and was studying it. On this score, Gyorke remarked that Hungary would like to eliminate all the 'blank spots' of its history, such as the events of 1956.

Despite its economic difficulties, the Soviet Union invariably strives for economic co-operation that coincide with its national interests, Lukyanov said.

Rehabilitation Cooperation Planned With GDR

LD1409142190 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1331 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—The USSR Attorney General's Office has assured German judicial bodies that it will convey information at their request for rehabilitation procedures on trials conducted by Soviet courts against Germans in the past. This was agreed in Moscow during talks between representatives of the USSR and GDR justice ministries.

As reported in a press release, other aspects of further cooperation were also discussed in addition to close collaboration between both sides in the area of rehabilitation. USSR Minister of Justice Veniamin Yakovlev reasserted his "interest in close cooperation with the justice ministries of the future laender" on the territory of today's GDR.

West Europe

Italy's De Michelis Conducts Visit to Moscow

Opens Talks With Shevardnadze

LD1509073790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0710 GMT 15 Sep 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Zharkov]

[Text] Moscow, 15 Sep (TASS)—Questions of the development of Soviet-Italian relations, particularly in the economic sphere, will presumably be discussed during the talks which began here today between Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, and his Italian colleague, Gianni de Michelis, who arrived yesterday evening for a working visit.

Interviewed by the TASS correspondent, Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, said that during the dialogue questions of improving the treaty-legal base will probably be touched upon. Apart from that, he said, a large section of the conversation will be devoted to the development of political and economic contacts between the USSR and the EEC, since at the present time Italy holds the chairmanship of the European Council.

Among the other international problems which it is proposed to discuss are the situation in the Persian Gulf region, and preparations for the Paris summit. "This is connected with the declaration about relations between the countries of the Warsaw Pact and NATO," Yuliy Kvitsinskiy noted.

Foresees Friendship Treaty

AU1509170890 Rome ANSA in English 1233 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] (ANSA) Moscow, September 15 — Italian Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis started a round of talks with Soviet leaders here Saturday morning, meeting with his Soviet counterpart Eduard Shevardnadze. Later in the day, he will be received by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Speaking to journalists on the plane taking him to Moscow, De Michelis outlined the aim of his visit, saying that he will propose the signing of a friendship treaty along the lines of the one signed this week by the Soviet Union and West Germany. This friendship treaty, he said, would take into account the new international situation and the unprecedented collaboration relations which are being forged between states.

The treaty, De Michelis said, could be signed in mid-December, during a proposed visit to Italy by Gorbachev. The Soviet president, who was invited Italy last week to receive the Fiuggi International Prize from Italian Premier Giulio Andreotti, has still to give the definite go-ahead for the trip.

According to De Michelis, the treaty would set down, in comprehensive form, the terms of cooperation between the two countries in the economic, political, social, cultural, technical and scientinir fields.

De Michelis revealed that Rome has been considering such a friendship treaty with Moscow for some time, stressing that Italy is in a position to have the best relationship of all Western countries with the Soviet Union, apart from the special relationship between Moscow and Bonn.

The main aim of his visit, however, was to examine economic relations between the two countries, and the possibility of Italian support for the profound reforms taking place within the Soviet Union. But of course, he added, the Gulf crisis and other pressing international issues also would also figure prominently in his talks.

On Friday, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said that De Michelis' "working visit" came within the framework of the traditional friendly relationship between Italy and the Soviet Union, and that his talks would center on "Italian support for the implementation of economic reforms in the USSR, the Persian Gulf crisis, and preparations for the CSCE (Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe)" in Paris in November.

This was confirmed Saturday by Deputy Foreign Minister Yuli Kvitsinski, who said the talks would examine ways of developing bilateral relations, especially in the economic field, and issues connected with "improving the legal bases of cooperation" between the two countries.

Kvitsinski added that De Michelis and Shevardnadze would also examine the state of relations between the Soviet Union and the European Community, of which Italy holds the rotating presidency.

After his talks with Shevardnadze and Gorbachev, De Michelis will hold a joint press conference with the Soviet foreign minister, and leave for Rome shortly afterwards.

States Views on Gulf Crisis

LD1509150290 Moscow TASS in English 1420 GMT 15 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Rublevskiy]

[Text] Moscow September 15 TASS—The Italian and Soviet sides have stated that their views on the Gulf crisis are almost fully identical. Their vision of the situation and ways to positively settle the Gulf crisis are very close to each other, Italian foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis told a news conference here today.

While in the Soviet Union, the Italian minister met President Mikhail Gorbachev and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze to discuss, among other things, the Persian Gulf crisis.

The sides agreed that the settlement of the crisis was possible only within the framework of respective U.N. Security Council resolutions, the Italian minister noted.

For this purpose, it is necessary to maximally pressure Iraq and work towards its political and economic isolation. According to De Michelis, the sides agreed that further efforts were needed to make the embargo more effective and complete.

The Italian minister discussed with Soviet politicians a number of initiatives which could be taken as a package or in combination.

He said the initiatives referred to the possible adoption of a joint Euro-Soviet statement on the Middle East issues. The Soviet Union found it necessary to support the Italian proposal to convene a Euro-Arab meeting, excepting Iraq, and render needed assistance to ensure its success.

The meeting's chief goal will be discussing prospects for cooperation between the European Community and the Arab world after the Iraqi-Kuwaiti crisis.

The Italian minister said that he had briefed the Soviet president on the Italian initiative to convoke a Helsinki-type international conference on security and cooperation in the Middle East and Mediterranean region.

Its goal, De Michelis said, is primarily to put on record rules and principles on which to base coexistence, cooperation and security in the Middle East and Mediterranean region.

Remarks on Israeli Relations

LD1509124590 Moscow TASS in English 1231 GMT 15 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] The Soviet Union is ready to recognise Israel if the latter agrees to participate in an international Middle East conference, Italian Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis told a news conference here today.

The minister, who met President Mikhail Gorbachev today, was asked whether they discussed the content of Gorbachev's Friday meeting with two Israeli ministers.

De Michelis said: "I can say only that President Gorbachev told me about the Soviet side's readiness to immediately recognise Israel if the latter agrees to participate in an international conference, which would determine rules and principles for security and cooperation in the region."

The Italian minister was the first foreign politician to meet Gorbachev after his meeting with Israeli Finance Minister Yitzhaq Moda'i and Minister of Power Engineering, Science and Technology Yuval Ne'eman.

The Israeli delegation is visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Outlines Cooperation Prospects

LD1509150990 Moscow TASS in English 1442 GMT 15 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Rublevskiy]

[Text] Moscow September 15 TASS—Bilateral relations were extensively discussed during his meetings with Soviet Government members, Italian Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis told a news conference here today.

While in the Soviet Union, the Italian minister met President Mikhail Gorbachev and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze to discuss forms and the extent of Italian contribution to stabilization measures and economic reform in the Soviet Union.

Italy is expected to issue credits amounting to nearly 3000 billion Italian lireS in the short-term, the minister said.

Soviet and Italian firms intend to cooperate in the realization of a number of projects within the European Community framework, he pointed out.

The projects in question include the creation of a stabilization and currency reform fund for the Soviet Union, a balance of payment support fund for the next three-to-four years, a multilateral project to use Soviet fuel-and-power resources and a medium-term multilateral project to realise Soviet potential in the field of telecommunications, primarily international.

The sides, Gianni de Michelis pointed out, stated that the time was ripe for holding negotiations and signing a new treaty of friendship and cooperation between Italy and the Soviet Union in the field of culture, science and technology and other fields they will find suitable.

The treaty should be brought into line with new realities in Italo-Soviet, European and world relations, De Michelis said.

The Italian side, the minister stressed, expressed the desire to have the treaty signed in Rome during the visit President Gorbachev agreed to pay to Italy.

Announces Credit to Moscow

AU1509204690 Paris AFP in English 1809 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, Sept 15 (AFP)—Italy has decided to grant a credit line of more than three trillion lire (2.5 billion dollars) to the Soviet Union, Italian Foreign Minister Gianni De Michelis announced here Saturday. He told a news conference that the funds would include an immediate loan of a billion dollars guaranteed by the Italian Government.

Mr. De Michelis, who met for more than two hours with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, said that "For the short term, our proposal is for opening a series of credit lines of more than three trillion lire, the most significant part of which is a billion-dollar credit guaranteed by the (Italian) Government.

"As to the medium term, on the other hand, over the next few days we have to decide on the exact amount of the Italian effort to support perestroika," he said, adding that he was referring to a three-to-four year period.

The two sides agreed during their talks to "prepare an Italian-Soviet treaty very quickly concerning all aspects of political, economic and cultural cooperation between the two countries," the Italian minister said.

Confers With Gorbachev 15 Sep

LD1609062690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] President Mikhail Gorbachev met in the Kremlin today Italy's Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis.

The Soviet-Italian friendly dialogue was continued, stressing today's most acute major problems. An assessment was given of the implementation of the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Italy last year and of the Soviet-Italian summit in July 1990.

The situation is now such, Mikhail Gorbachev noted, that there is a need to act unremittingly and act together. Great changes are taking place. Not all of them can be clearly discerned at this moment and it is still difficult to grasp their overall significance.

Therefore, it is important to think current developments through and through and to become actively involve in efforts to secure their positive trend. The role Italy plays in this is irreplaceable, as are its present leaders who act as vigorous builders of new international relations and make their constructive, specifically Italian contribution.

De Michelis handed to Gorbachev a message from Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti, expressing solidarity and political will of the Italian Government and the Italian people to render specific, tangible support to deep reforms in the Soviet Union.

De Michelis told the Soviet president that Italy was ready to offer a considerable sum in credits to finance the supplies to the Soviet Union of consumer goods and to help meet other pressing needs.

The sides agreed to finalise the drawing up of a treaty of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Italy in time for signing during the next summit.

They also noted the major significance for the two countries and the world of the joint Soviet-Italian declaration adopted last year.

Much attention was devoted to the Persian Gulf crisis. Gorbachev talked to De Michelis in detail about his recent meeting with President George Bush in Helsinki.

He expressed confidence in the ability of the international community at the new stage of its development to work towards a political settlement.

Gorbachev and De Michelis considered some new ideas from the viewpoint of their joint determination to consistently implement respective resolutions of the U.N. Security Council.

President Gorbachev received with approval the proposal that the European Community and the Soviet Union should make a joint statement.

On behalf of the European Council, De Michelis told Gorbachev about the initiative to hold—in early October in Venice—a joint conference of the European Council's member-countries and Arab countries with the aim of considering principles and rules for resolving problems and ensuring security in the Middle East and Mediterranean region.

Having thoroughly analysed the ideas and proposals voiced during the meeting, Gorbachev stated they had a certain similarity with the approaches he had outlined during his summit with President George Bush, especially as regards the stimulation of the Arab factor.

He noted the importance of the growing activity—along and together with the American one—of the European component in the search for ways to overcome the dangerous international crisis, and of the fact that the question is being raised in a strategic perspective.

As a result, the field for multilateral actions is being expanded, in this case—on the European-Arab basis. This is significant and beneficial also for restructuring of the entire mechanism of world politics.

Gorbachev asked De Michelis to convey his gratitude once again to the council of the Fiugi Fund and its president Giulio Andreotti for awarding him the 1990 International Prize.

The meeting was attended by Shevarnadze, (Batay), and Ambassadors Adamishin and Salleo.

Calls Talks 'Exceptionally Useful'

PM1609192590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by A. Suvorov: "USSR-Italy: Exceptionally Useful Meetings"]

[Excerpts] "Our meetings and talks in Moscow, including the two-hour conversation with President Mikhail Gorbachev, were exceptionally useful and important," Italian Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis said when opening a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists at the end of a one-day working visit to our country. He stressed that idea at the end of the news conference, as though drawing journalists' attention to the fact that in this case it is not the form of the visit but its content that is important. [passage omitted]

In the Italian minister's words, an "almost complete coincidence of view" was established in the assessment of the situation in the Persian Gulf. The two sides see movement toward a settlement of the conflict exclusively in the framework of the relevant UN Security Council resolutions and as far as possible by political and diplomatic means. An accord was reached on a joint "Euro-Soviet" initiative, which is to be expressed in the adoption of a declaration on the Middle East during the meeting in New York 26 September between USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and the foreign ministers of the 12 EC countries. In De Michelis' words, the Italians have managed to convince the Soviet side of the expediency of supporting the idea of holding a European-Arab meeting in Venice 7-8 October excluding Iraq. Naturally, journalists showed increased attention to the crisis in the Persian Gulf, the sides' views on the possibility of settling it, and the creation in the longer term of a reliable mechanism for maintaining security in this region.

As for the all-European process, the minister noted full mutual understanding has been reached on the need to do everything to promote the speediest progress at the Vienna talks and the successful forthcoming Paris summit of CSCE states. [passage omitted]

'Text' of Soviet-Italian Communique Released

PM1709092890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Text] Moscow, 15 Sep (TASS)—We are transmitting the full text of the joint Soviet-Italian communique which was circulated here today. It states:

On 15 September, Gianni de Michelis, minister of foreign affairs of Italy, was in Moscow on a working visit. He was received by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Talks took place between Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Gianni de Michelis.

It was agreed as a result of talks and negotiations to begin preparations for a Soviet-Italian treaty in the nearest future, which will embrace all spheres of political, economic, and cultural cooperation between the two countries. This treaty on friendship, cooperation, and mutual understanding, which is to be signed at summit level, is required to reflect the new quality of relations between the two states. Cooperation between the two friendly countries should be one of the essential elements which form the situation in Europe, which facilitate the development of the Helsinki process, and the development of security and cooperation structures in this context and a single legal, economic, ecological, cultural, and other spheres in Europe.

Mutual understanding was achieved over the fact that the Italian side will adopt significant measures to lend assistance in implementing the economic reforms in the Soviet Union. To this end, the Italian Government will take steps responding to the scale of this task in the financial and economic spheres to create favorable conditions for the development of Soviet-Italian trade and cooperation. Specific agreements on these questions will be worked out within the near future. The Italian side stated that it will also assist the adoption of relevant measures on a multilateral basis, in particular within the framework of the European Community.

The sides expressed a united opinion regarding the need to guarantee the success of the forthcoming CSCE summit conference in Paris. In this connection, the need was stressed to elaborate a weighty final document from this meeting, rich in content, and to speed up the preparation of a joint declaration of the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries, the pivot of which should be the clause that the period of the "cold war" and confrontation in Europe is ending and a new stage of peaceful and goodneighborly relations is beginning.

The significance was stressed of the timely completion of the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces and confidence-building measures in Europe. The ministers also noted the importance of accelerating the work to conclude an international convention on banning chemical weapons at the conference on disarmament in Europe. Both sides will make a contribution—individually and jointly with their allies—in order to achieve these aims.

The USSR and Italy are fully determined to promote all steps aimed at increasing international cooperation in the Mediterranean, including its political, economic, ecological, and humanitarian dimensions.

Both sides confirm their condemnation of the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait, and favor a most rapid and complete compliance with the UN Security Council resolutions on this issue. They demand that the Iraqi authorities give all foreign citizens detained in Iraq and Kuwait the chance to leave freely, and stress that encroachments upon the status of diplomatic missions and their staff in Kuwait are impermissible.

The USSR and Italy believe that events in the Persian Gulf zone underline the need for wide ranging measures to improve the situation in the Near East as a whole, and to create reliable structures of regional security there on the basis of agreed norms and principles.

The talks bore a friendly, frank, and constructive character, which reflects the profound positive changes which have been taking place in Soviet-Italian relations of late. It has been agreed to continue consultations between ministers of foreign affairs on a regular basis on all bilateral and international issues which may be of mutual interest to the USSR and Italy.

British Foreign Secretary Hurd Continues Visit

Meets With Yeltsin 13 Sep

PM1709082890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by TASS correspondent S. Zharkov: "Meeting Between B.N. Yeltsin and D. Hurd"]

[Text] The demarcation of functions between the central government and the republics. This fundamental question of our country's domestic political life, it seems, is beginning to concern foreign states more and more. It was at the center of attention during the 13 September meeting between B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, and British Foreign Secretary D. Hurd.

The RSFSR's autonomous foreign policy, B.N. Yeltsin said, is connected with the proclamation of its sovereignty. He noted that despite the possibility of the republics' pursuing different lines, "it is necessary to fix boundaries before integrating." Such is the experience of history. We have delegated to the center only a small part of our powers: defense, the KGB, the Ministry of Railways, Aeroflot, communications, and the power industry. Everything else on our territory belongs to Russia, particularly the entire defense industry, he stressed.

The head of the Russian parliament mentioned that during his meeting with M. Thatcher, the prime minister responded to his proposal to conclude a bilateral treaty between Britain and Russia by saying that first the RSFSR must become autonomous. This has now been done, he said. It goes without saying that general political treaties, such as, for example, the settlement regarding Germany, are concluded by the center. Russia is ready to go along with them. But as for more specific agreements—economic, scientific and technical, social, and cultural—the republic's interests must be defended by its own representatives.

At the end of the conversation, D. Hurd said that the whole world is attentively watching the actions of M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin. In his opinion, in the event of conflict between them the international community will lose confidence in the Soviet Union's having a good chance of emerging from the crisis quickly and making further progress. And conversely, the world's hopes will sharply increase if they work together toward the privatization of property, the decentralization of the economy, and pluralism. At the first session of the Federation Council, B.N. Yeltsin said, "We took a step toward one another and held out a hand to one another. If there was something between us, that must be forgotten for the sake of Russia and of peace. Now we are trying to put that into practice."

Received by Gorbachev 14 Sep

LD1409165390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev today received British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd in the Kremlin. He evaluated highly the international role of Soviet-British dialogue. The European process, especially in connection with the appearance of a united Germany, is acquiring new aspects. In this matter, the mutual understanding between the USSR and Great Britain is of lasting significance.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev informed the British minister of his—as he expressed himself—in-depth and probing dialogue with the U.S. President. He aquainted him with the ideas and arguments which figured at the meeting in Helsinki.

There followed an exchange of opinions on possible scenarios for developments in the area of the Persian Gulf, and of the most advisable—from the point of view of the interlocutors—means of action.

Taking part in the meeting were: Shevardnadze, Primakov, Weston, Zamyatin, Braithwaite, and Wall.

Today, Douglas Hurd addressed journalists at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center. I am leaving the Soviet Union, he stated, with a clear idea of the importance of all the processes taking place in this country.

Discusses 'In-Depth' Dialogue

PM1509211990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev Meets with D. Hurd"]

[Text] On 14 September, the USSR president received British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd in the Kremlin. He began the conversation with a high appraisal of the international role of Soviet-British dialogue. At the present moment there are even more factors and incentives to increase its intensity. I highly value that which has been created in our relations thanks to Mrs Margaret Thatcher, M.S. Gorbachev stressed, and bearing in mind all that is happening in the world today cooperation between us is even more desirable.

The European process is acquiring new aspects and new qualities, particularly in connection with the appearance of a united Germany, and the task of protecting it from disruptions and distortions and of increasing its positive content demands constant attention and active cooperation among all its participants, including the United States, of course. In this regard mutual understanding between the USSR and Britain is of lasting significance. That is a constant factor in Soviet European policy. M.S. Gorbachev suggested that they should jointly consider whether or not the time has come to register the real progress in Soviet-British relations, which have reached a certain level, in an international legal form.

The president drew attention to the fact that judging by certain alarming events, certain forces in some East European countries want to reduce the transformations taking place there to ideological revanche. This is dangerous not only for the democratic character of those transformations but also for the movement of states and peoples toward a new Europe.

M.S. Gorbachev briefed the British minister on what he called his in-depth explorative dialogue with the U.S. President and acquainted him with the ideas and arguments which figured at the Helsinki meeting. There followed an exchange of opinions on possible scenarios of the development of events in the Persian Gulf region and on what the interlocutors thought were the most expedient means of action.

At D. Hurd's request, M.S. Gorbachev gave a concise account of the time that the country is living through now and in this connection made the point that in the forthcoming period of intensive stabilization, perestroyka needs real solidarity on the part of those who have recognized its universal significance.

E.A. Shevardnadze, Ye.M. Primakov, J. Weston, L.M. Zamyatin, R. Braithwaite, and P. Wall took part.

Confers With Shevardnardze

PM1609182990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Soviet-British Talks"]

[Text] Talks took place 14 September between USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and UK Foreign Secretary D. Hurd, who is paying a working visit to the Soviet Union.

During the frank and businesslike conversation it was noted with satisfaction that Soviet-British political dialogue is having a perceptible influence on the two countries' conceptual approaches to the solution of topical international problems and questions of bilateral cooperation. Relations between the USSR and Britain have reached a new level and mutual suspicion and prejudice have given way to cooperation and partnership.

An example of the new character of the two countries' mutual relations is their joint activity to resolve the crisis in the Persian Gulf. The unity of the USSR and Britain, as of other countries, in their assessments of Iraq's aggression is an important element in the elaboration of the principled position of the UN Security Council and has helped that organ to adopt effective resolutions forming the basis of a just settlement. The ministers stressed the two sides' desire to resolve the present explosive situation by political means. They expressed the common opinion that any armed explosion would be fraught with grave consequences not only for the Middle East but for the world as a whole.

An important place in the talks was occupied by question of European policy. The Soviet side noted that the Thatcher government's new ideas on possible ways of forming a just and open Europe are fully consonant with the Soviet vision of European processes and offer new opportunities for meaningful political cooperation.

The sides discussed progress in the preparation of the Paris CSCE summit conference. The ministers were united in the view that this event will be a landmark in European history. It was noted that real preconditions have emerged for achieving major accords at the Paris conference.

E.A. Shevardnadze pointed out that a special place among the meeting's documents should be occupied by the joint declaration of the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries, which would represent the practical embodiment of the principles of the new political thinking in European politics and would lay the foundation for cooperation on the key questions in the conditions of the renewed Europe.

The sides confirmed their desire to finalize the preparation of a substantial agreement on conventional arms reduction in Europe by the Paris meeting.

The ministers agreed to give instructions to speed up work on these and other documents due to be signed in Paris.

Questions of expanding financial and economic cooperation between the two countries occupied an important place in the discussion of Soviet-British bilateral relations. E.A. Shevardnadze noted that the Soviet Union treated with attention the ideas expressed by the British leadership on helping the USSR to accomplish its economic reform. The Soviet side appreciates the understanding of the problems faced by the Soviet economy during the transition to the market and welcomes the readiness to take them into account in the process of improving bilateral trade and economic ties.

The ministers exchanged opinions on a number of specific projects and examined questions of organizing cooperation in certain priority areas of the Soviet economy.

On the same day D. Hurd laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin wall.

Holds News Conference

LD1409160390 Moscow TASS in English 1531 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov and Sergey Skripnikov]

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—British Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Douglas Hurd told a news conference in Moscow today that he realised full well the importance and complexity of the measures taken in the USSR for the benefit of economic reform and a market system.

Hurd paid a working visit to Moscow and took part in the "two plus four" meeting of foreign ministers.

The British secretary said the three days in Moscow were extremely interesting and exciting. Speaking about his meetings with President Mikhail Gorbachev and Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze today, Hurd said they discussed in detail bilateral relations and ways to extend Soviet-British dialogue. The conversations focused on the Gulf crisis, prospects for Conventional Forces in Europe talks and the CSCE summit meeting in November in Paris.

In reply to journalists, Hurd said that he and Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin discussed yesterday the possible conclusion of a treaty between Britain and the Russian Federation. However, he said, speaking about Russian Federation independence, Yeltsin did not doubt the way the British side conducted bilateral talks with the Soviet Union at the current stage.

Speaking about the prospects for British economic aid to the Soviet Union, Hurd said his government studies the possibility of giving aid to the Soviet Union in the process of economic privatisation and movement to the market. The question of large financial credits is considered in the context of the reports of the European Commission and the International Monetary Fund which will be drafted at the end of the year.

Speaking about the Gulf situation, Hurd said that the position of his country remains unchanged and is very close to [the] Soviet position.

Maximum efforts should be exerted to roll back Iraqi aggression against Kuwait by peaceful means, he said. This is also the position of the Soviet Government.

According to Hurd, everybody wants this crisis to be solved by peaceful means, but Britain retains the right to undertake other measures, if the current measures prove insufficient.

Noting the USSR's constructive role in settling the crisis, Hurd said that Gorbachev and Shevardnadze stressed the need to preserve and continue sanctions with respect to Iraq and, if need be, to toughen them.

The Soviet Union is fully involved in building up economic and politicial pressure on the aggressor.

Hurd said that his government is not going to comply with Iraq's instructions to close embassies in Kuwait and stressed that the British ambassador would remain there as long as is physically possible.

Asked about British position on the CSCE summit meeting in Paris in November, Hurd said it remains unchanged. The forum must be preceded by the signing of an agreement on conventional forces in Vienna.

Supreme Soviet

Moscow TV Broadcasts 14 Sep Supreme Soviet

Aganbagyan Delivers Report

LD1409195390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1740 GMT on 14 September broadcasts a recording of today's USSR Supreme Soviet session of commissions and committees held in Moscow. The announcer sets the scene saying that the committees and commissions continued discussion of economic reform programs today and that reports were delivered by Aganbegyan and Abalkin.

Aganbagyan is then heard delivering a report on work to combine the best of both economic programs. He says it is very important that the republics have already expressed approval of Shatalin's program in view of the number of declarations of sovereignty. The republics each have their own special conditions and should have some local control over how reform is carried out; they must feel that the program belongs to them. Adoption of another program would cause conflict with the republics, in particular with the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic which has already endorsed Shatalin's program.

Aganbegyan then says that stability and money-financial balance must be ensured; if there is excess money then prices will rise. Shatalin's program stresses stabilization and means a less painful transition to the market. Republics can have local price regulations if they see a need for it, so there is no danger of prices running out of control. He says that Shatalin's program also allows for keeping control of over 20 to 30 percent of prices for essentials to begin with. Aganbegyan says that these two aspects are the main ones in favor of Shatalin's program.

He then goes on to discuss some aspects of the Shatalin program which suffered from precise information, unlike the government program. The government program's section on cadres policy has been put into the final combined report as well as some other provisions. He says the final corrected report was delivered to Gorbachev, who made decisions on some questions after consultations with republican leaders. Provisions concerning supremacy of republican laws were eliminated, as they are the province of the Union treaty.

Aganbegyan says that one major discord remains between the two programs: how to carry out the freeing of prices; the government calls for price reforms from 1 January, dictated by the center, with later inevitable rises when market prices are introduced, stretching over two years. According to Shatalin's program, he says, market prices are introduced from the start, stage by stage, according to type of goods, over one year. There would be indexing of wages and benefits to provide rises in line with prices. Prices of some 20 to 30 percent of basic consumer goods would remain stable over the year.

At 1800 GMT Academician Shatalin is shown delivering a report. He says that a normal economy is needed, not the "economy of the madhouse." The first principle he works from is that nothing should be forced on anybody. The program does not stipulate private or other forms of property, but rather allows for the existence of a variety with various niches occupied by whatever is most suitable for them. As for land, the program says there could be different forms of ownership in the different republics.

Shatalin says that account was taken of the fact that there are now sovereign republics in reality as sovereign states. Taxes and fiscal policy have to be seen in this context. Replying to accusations that his working group plans to break up the Soviet Union, Shatalin says their aim was to cement the Union, to tie it together economically. He says the concept has been one of a unified Union market.

Shatalin says that the program is designed to allow for accountability to the people. Stabilization of the economy has been kept in focus, primarily stabilization of the financial and monetary citizens. The ruble must be strong; nothing can succeed without strong and effective measures to protect its worth.

Union Treaty Still Not Ready

LD1409195490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1813 GMT on 14 September continues its broadcast of a recording of today's USSR Supreme Soviet commissions and committees meeting in Moscow.

Shatalin continues his report, saying that measures for social protection are included in the program so that there is wage compensation for rising prices. He says the aim is not to make rich people as poor as the poor people, but to bring the poor majority up to a decent standard of living. What is needed for this, he says, is a normal market economy.

Talking about the military economy, Shatalin says it has horrific proportions and serious attention must be given to conversion. The balance of the economy is too much in favor of heavy industry.

At 1821 GMT Academician Abalkin is shown delivering a report about the need to modernize the Soviet economy.

Abalkin speaks about the plans for budget incomes: There would be a Union budget with proportions of tax income from republics being handed over to the center and the rest disposed of locally.

Abalkin says the Union treaty is still not ready and he calls for a cease-fire period so that necessary laws can be adopted.

Abalkin continues his speech, talking about the various projects submitted. He says that one serious disagreement concerns the future national-state structure. Some

98 percent of the Shatalin group's proposals have come into the final combined draft in one form or another.

Abalkin says that nowhere in the world is sovereignty absolute, and he recalls the basic human need for some form of control by authority. If sovereign states sign a treaty, then they voluntarily give up a part of their sovereignty. The government's program is based on a renovated but federative state. Abalkin says he would like a proper answer to the question of whether the Union is itself a state or not.

Abalkin then states that if the renewed Union is to be a state, it must have economic systems and rules in common across it. The existing system does sufficiently protect the rights of the republics. Their representatives are in parliament to speak for them, thus they participate in making the laws by which they have to live.

Abalkin goes on to say the programs concur on one thing: that whatever program is adopted, it must be actually implemented to do any good and not remain a mere document. Implementation must take place at all levels throughout the country, which will require nationwide accord. Economic ties must not be broken, nor artificial barriers erected.

At 1837 GMT the announcer says questions and answers lasted three and a half hours and identifies some speakers as video of them at the rostrum is shown. The announcer says that no decisons were adopted today, but the proper parliamentary process is under way.

Aganbegyan Advocates Shatalin Economic Program

LD1409143590 Moscow TASS in English 1358 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—Today's joint session of several committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet was addressed by three academicians, economists by profession, who took part in working out draft programmes of the country's transition to a market-oriented system—Abel Aganbegyan, Stanislav Shatalin and Leonid Abalkin.

Aganbegyan, who headed the "conciliatory commission," admitted that the joint draft programme drawn up under his supervision was based on the programme worked out by the Shatalin group, which was created on the joint decision of Soviet President Gorbachev and President of the Russian Federation Boris Yeltsin. He substantiated his stand with some facts.

Aganbebyan said that, in the first place, the Shatalin programme is supported by the authorities of Union republics. Since it would be "sheer madness" to do something now by-passing them, it is necessary to give up the "centralist approach," on which the government programme is based.

It is also important that the Shatalin commission proposes a less painful transition period, which is based on the stabilisation of economy, Aganbegyan continued. He did not agree with the view of Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov that "as a result of the implementation of the Shatalin programme prices will go up several-fold". "The total of prices cannot exceed the total of money in circulation. This is why calculations of the Shatalin group seem to be quite correct to me," Aganbegyan said.

The joint programme took into account many of the government's remarks, he stressed. It expanded mathematical calculations and sections dealing with the social protection of people, analysed all problems dealing with agriculture in a separate section and adopted without any changes the government section about the training of the personnel. The section of the programme dealing with foreign economic activities was made more profound.

At the same time, he admitted, it proved to be impossible to smooth down some basic differences. Aside from the inclination to centralism which, in the opinion of Aganbegyan, is at variance with the present-day reality, he expressed a negative attitude to the government's approach to the price reform. He said that the administrative price increase before the transition to a market-oriented system, with the compensation to the population for the expenditures, will weaken the rouble, will not bring more consumer goods to the shelves of the shops and "will discredit once and for all the idea of the market in public opinion". It is this difference in approaches to the price reform that made it impossible "to make a single programme out of two ones", Aganbegyan said. This is why the USSR Supreme Soviet will have to choose between them.

Aganbegyan said that, at the direct instruction of Gorbachev, some changes were made in the joint programme, including the removal from the document of the section dealing with the supremacy of republican laws over Union ones, the preservation of a federal tax together with republican taxes and the future of Union governing structures. All these problems will be resolved by a new Union treaty, Aganbegyan said.

Shatalin, Abalkin Comment on Economic Program

LD1409142790 Moscow TASS in English 1405 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—Stanislav Shatalin, who headed a team specially created by the Soviet president and the chairman of the Russian Federation parliament, expressed regret "that there was no cooperation with the government." He said the group tried "to create a normal economy rather than the economy of madness and distorted mirrors, in which we lived for 73 years".

Speaking about the main principles of his programme, Shatalin said the independence of Union republics is an objective reality.

"We are accused of an attempt to tear the Soviet Union apart. But we tried to keep the renovated Union together through economic methods," he said. This attitude was supported by all Union republics.

Having noted that his programme is "not a market programme but only a blueprint for the transition to a market", Shatalin described it "as very moderate" and admitted that he personally advocated a more radical approach.

Replying to criticism of the name of the programme (500 days), Shatalin attributed it to "the desire to put the programme under people's control". Its central plank is rouble stabilisation. The only alternative to this, Shatalin said, is "very bad barter trade". He rejected accusations that his programme "plays into the hands of black market dealers". Economists are not dealing with criminals, he said, and "it is the job of militia to catch swindlers".

Representatives of labour collectives across the country familiarised themselves with the programme. "Although I cannot claim that it is supported by the entire working class, it has the support of workers on the whole," Shatalin continued.

Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin, one of the main authors of the government programme, emphasised the continuity of the work of the USSR Council of Ministers.

"It had the mandate of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies which supported the moderate-radical programme of transition to the market," he said. The stages that were defined late last year are observed. 1990 is a preparatory year, 1991-1992 is about transition to the market, and 1992 to 1995 will see the establishment of the market. Market-related legislation is also catching up.

Criticising Shatalin's concept, Abalkin said the proposed measures of stabilisation, particularly, curbing the budget deficit, are unreal, and the attempts to review the existing laws can bring "uncontrolled inflation".

On the question of sovereignty of Union republics and the powers of Union bodies of management, Abalkin said "the Soviet Government based itself on the fact that the USSR remains a single state. If this is not so, then we should speak about the economic agreement between sovereign states," he said.

Abalkin set out three conditions for the fulfilment of the programme. These are the mandatory nature of decisions, social consensus, needed to check the country's slide into chaos, and the preservation of existing economic ties. He proposed "to announce truce" between the republics and the centre until the conclusion of a new Union treaty and "to live in the framework of existing laws".

After that the parliament began discussing alternative programmes.

Session Focuses on Economy, Destabilization

LD1509142490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1250 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 15 Sep (TASS)—The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium met today under the chairmanship of Anatoliy Lukyanov.

Under consideration was the question of the organization of work relating to the discussion of a program of urgent measures to stabilize the country's economy and a program for the transition to a regulated market economy. Valentin Vologzhin, chairman of the Committee for Economic Reform, reported on how it was planned to organize the work in committees of the Supreme Soviet and the permanent commissions of its chambers. In conjunction with the Commission for the Social and Economic Development of Union and Autonomous Republics, Autonomous Oblasts and Okrugs, and with the Commission for Labor, Prices and Social Policy, the committee was instructed to generalize the results of the examination of the question in the supreme soviets of the republics and the soviets of people's deputies of the autonomous oblasts and okrugs, and to present its proposals and conclusions at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Urgent measures to overcome the destabilization of society, to stop instances of violence, and to ensure the safety of citizens were discussed, and appropriate instructions in this connection were issued.

A group to analyze the currency and money-supply policy within the country was set up to implement the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Other matters were also considered at the sitting.

Proposed Agenda for Fourth Session Published

PM1409145790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 1

["USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution on the Agenda for the Fourth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet has decided:

I. To approve the following agenda for the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet:

1) On urgent measures to stabilize the national economy and programs for the transition to a regulated market economy.

2) On the course of consultations and the concept for a new Union Treaty.

3) On the work practice of supreme bodies of state power in view of the Declarations on State Sovereignty and Independence, adopted by the republics.

4) On supplies of food and industrial goods for the population and preparations for the winter.

5) On the USSR's international standing in connection with the events in the Persian Gulf.

6) On draft USSR laws and other decisions geared to ensuring the USSR's transition to a market economy.

7) On the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1991, on the USSR State Budget for 1991 and the report on the implementation of the USSR State Budget for 1989.

8) On the draft Principles of USSR and Union Republican Civil Legislation.

9) On the convening of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies.

10) Draft laws submitted for a second reading:

a) on public associations;
b) on freedom of conscience and on religious organizations;
c) on leave;
d) on the Soviet militia.

11) Draft laws submitted for a first reading:

a) on the draft Law on Trade Unions' Rights;
b) on the draft Principles of USSR and Union Republican Legislation on Public Education;
c) on inventions in the USSR;
d) on military reform;
e) on state security bodies in the USSR.

12) Questions of monitoring the implementation of legislative acts:

a) on the implementation of laws on ownership, on land, on the lease system, on the principles of economic relations in the USSR and union and autonomous republics, on local self-management and the local economy, and other legislative acts;

b) on prorgress in implementing the USSR Supreme Soviet resolutions on the problems of the Aral Sea, the elimination of the aftermath of the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station, and other USSR Supreme Soviet decisions.

II. To stipulate that the order in which the items on the agenda are examined is dependent on whether draft laws are ready and on the progress that has been made in the discussion of them at the USSR Supreme Soviet session and in USSR Supreme Soviet committees and chamber's standing commissions.

III. To instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to set up before 25 September 1990 a Group to Analyze Policy in the Country on Currency and the Issuing of Money.

[Signed] USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Lukyanov

[Dated] The Kremlin, Moscow, 11 September 1990

Gorbachev Addresses 17 Sep Supreme Soviet Session

LD1709064590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] A sitting of the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet opened in Moscow 30 minutes ago. Reports will be delivered on certain measures to stabilize the country's economy and the program for the switch to a market economy. USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is now speaking on this issue.

Explains Transition to Market

LD1709083590 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] The Soviet president, Mikhail Gorbachev, has stated that the country's transition to market relations does not signify rejection of the socialist idea. The president spoke today at the joint meeting of the two houses of the USSR Supreme Soviet which is beginning to discuss measures to stabilize the national economy and also programs of going over to a regulated market economy.

The president stressed that the parliament of the USSR and those in the constituent republics are to take perhaps the most important decision of the years of perestroyka. As for people's apprehensions about moving over to the market, Mikhail Gorbachev explained that it means the existence of many different forms of ownership combining a socialism with people's personal interests and constant concern for the soical protection of the population.

The program that has been presented, he continued, provides for building a mixed economy where private property will play a substantial role in certain areas, but on the whole will play a limited role. In the opinion of Mikhail Gorbachev, the question of the private ownership of the land should be decided only through a referendum.

The president called on all the political forces of the country to concentrate on approving a program of stabilizing the economy and not on attempts to rock the existing structures of government. It is consolidation that is needed today, he said, and it is necessary to act proceeding from the interests of the people.

Rules Out Government Reshuffle

LD1709090190 Moscow TASS in English 0853 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Andrey Orlov and Yuriy Sizov]

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—It is impermissible to "force people into new forms of economic life" in defiance of "social realities, objective course of the historical process, interests of the people and their sentiments, psychology and attitude," President Mikhail Gorbachev told today's morning plenary meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, which is discussing for the second week running urgent measures to stabilise the situation in the country and to go over to a market economy.

Explaining his stand on various drafts of the country's transition to a market economy, Gorbachev said he favoured Academician Stanislav Shatalin's programme. Nevertheless, he said the document "could hardly be regarded as perfect and faultless". At the same time Gorbachev rejected accusations that Shatalin's programme "leads to capitalism". The president believes its merit is that it envisages transition through stabilisation and relies on the backing of Union republics.

"In renouncing one model, forcibly imposed on society in the past, we must not embark again on the road of subjectivism and armchair scheming, must avoid the mechanical transplantation of foreign experience on our soil," Gorbachev stressed.

Turning to the role of private property in Soviet economy, Gorbachev explained that it "would play a substantial role only in some domains, but a rather limited role in society as a whole". He said the introduction of private ownership of land was a problem of principle, stressing that it "must be decided by the people themselves through a referendum". This question is too important "to be decided in offices or at forums, even such a high one as this," Gorbachev emphasised.

Assessing the recent demands to "reshuffle top echelones of power in particular", Gorbachev said they were "absolutely unacceptable". He believes such a reshuffle "would draw us into grim political battles, would enhance confrontation in society at a time when we most badly need consolidation to carry out the market economy programme and to draft a new federal treaty".

Rounding off his speech, Gorbachev said that the country has entered a "phase of fundamental reforms". He warned against any confrontational steps that could aggravate the political situation in society.

The floor was then given to leading economists—authors of alternative programmes of transition to a market economy: Abel Aganbegyan, Stanislav Shatalin and Deputy Premier Leonid Abalkin.

Political & Social

Anti-Government Rally Held in Moscow 16 Sep

Organizers Hold News Conference

PM1509212390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 90 p 1

[Report by D. Babich: "On the '500 Days' Program"]

[Text] Yesterday there was a press conference at the Moscow City Soviet on the demonstration in Moscow planned for 16 September.

"The demonstration, which will begin at 1700 hours near Gorkiy Park, is being organized by the Moscow Voters Association, the Interregional Deputies Group, and the organizing committee for the creation of the 'Democratic Russia' movement," announced USSR People's Deputy Arkadiy Murashev, leader of "Democratic Russia." "But the most diverse groupings will be taking part. We advocate a left-center bloc and the active implementation of the Shatalin-Yavlinskiy program."

Organizers Not Against Gorbachev

LD1509190190 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] A press conference has been held at the Moscow Soviet on the all-Moscow demonstration it is planned to hold on 16 September. The aim of the demonstration is to back the Russian Supreme Soviet and the program of transition to the market that it has adopted.

A statement from the organizing committee talks of distancing itself from those who are trying to use the action to put forward demands for the resignation of the USSR president. It was stated at the press conference that the organizers of the demonstration have nothing to do with these demands. The constructive dialogue between Yeltsin and Gorbachev and the rapprochement in their positions with regard to the concept of reform is not to the liking of those whose interests are incompatible with a peaceful and gradual process of democratization, the transfer to the market economy and a civil society, says the statement (?made) at the press conference. For this reason, at the present time when the president and his team are making their choice in favor of radical reforms, such confrontation would be to the advantage only of the anti-market and anti-democratic forces that have still not lost their influence. Arkadiy Murashov, chairman of the organizing committee of the Democratic Russia Movement, said at the press conference that for the first time in the entire existence of the Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet the possibility of a left-centrist bloc being formed to implement the program has emerged. We have a plan of action that has been endorsed by the Supreme Soviet of Russia and we hope that it will be confirmed by the supreme soviets of the other Union republics. Its adoption at the Union level could lead to success. The left-centrist alliance anticipates a certain degree of support from the USSR president.

Demonstration Held in Gorkiy Park

OW1609174890 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Text] A large-scale rally and demonstration sponsored by many democratic organizations in the RSFSR and Moscow were held in Moscow today. The demonstration started at Gorkiy Culture Park at 1700 hours; a mass rally will be held in Kremlin Square in the center of Moscow. Its goal is to support the assembly of the RSFSR and its program for transition to the market economy. The program is widely known as the 500 Days program. It formally stipulates that within this time limit a series of comprehensive measures be carried out with the ultimate goal of denationalizing the economy. According to Moscow Mayor Popov, a people's deputy of the Soviet Union, one of the major slogans of the demonstration and rally is to ask the Soviet Government to resign. In his televised speech yesterday he said: Because of the government's indecision, it is impossible for the state to eliminate this serious situation. Popov said: The government is opposed to the real market. It is expected that a letter of appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union will be approved, asking it to accept the government's resignation.

According to foreign media at a news conference held earlier, organizers of the demonstration said they had nothing to do with those who took advantage of this action to ask the Soviet president to resign.

Government Resignation Demanded

AU1609152990 Paris AFP in English 1422 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Excerpt] Moscow, Sept 16 (AFP) — Some 20,000 protesters marched through the streets of Moscow Sunday [16 September] demanding radical economic reform and the resignation of the government of Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov.

The demonstrators, carrying banners calling for the resignation of the prime minister and supporting Russian Republic President Boris Yeltsin, marched peacefully from Moscow's Gorkiy Park to just outside the Kremlin walls.

One banner proclaimed "Yeltsin, the people believe in you," while another said "I have no confidence in Gorbachev, Ryzhkov and company." Yet another said "Better a resignation today than an execution tomorrow."

Various reformist opposition groups organized the authorised demonstration. A number of Russian flags and some Lithuanian flags were brandished by the demonstrators. [passage omitted]

Economic Reform Urged

LD1609173490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russia 1500 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Interview with various unidentified demonstration participants by correspondent Boris Simonov in Moscow 16 September—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] As we have already reported, on the initiative of a number of democratic organizations a demonstration and rally are taking place in Moscow. Our correspondent Boris Simonov has just returned to the studios. Here is his report:

[Begin recording] [Simonov] What has prompted you to come here to this demonstration today?

[Demonstrator] The 500 Days program.

[Simonov] That is, you want to support the 500 Day program?

[Demonstrator] Yes, that program only.

[Demonstrator] The same goes for me—to support the program and to express lack of confidence in Ryzhkov's government which is lagging behind the radical reforms.

[Simonov] People usually say: We are for the 500 Day program, we are against the Ryzhkov program, for instance. But what do we know about each of them? Is not it through hearsay or what we feel sure of? How does all this happen?

[Demonstrator] To begin with, we see all these debates on television and what the basic differences between the government program, Ryzhkov's one, and the 500 Day program are. We know what it is all about. Of course we should have more details.

[Demonstrator] Of course I am no economist, I am an ordinary person, a voter, and what I think is that this government is no use to us at all. What we really need is some small group doing the coordination, under the president you understand? I do not know how to determine it, maybe on the basis of a referendum, but then it would take a very long time to determine this group, or maybe on the basis of a sociological survey, but somehow these people should be defined, ones who have already shown themselves to be businesslike people.

[Simonov] Since we have not reached the law-governed state, we are presently exerting pressure through slogans, rallies, and so on. Is that the only way to somehow influence the situation in the country in favor of the interests of the people? [several demonstrators speak at once to say that it is]

[Demonstrator] Because the Ryzhkov government is issuing its program, so to speak, but does not take on any responsibility. Any government abroad would long ago have resigned after the first failure, but in our country it remains, regardless of the results you understand. The results are not tied up with the work. How can this be? So it will never go, however bad the results are, the worst results. The country will be brought to extremes in general, but it will not go. So we must help it.

[Demonstrator] As far as I can judge, we need the president to take upon himself the fullness of power and in the final analysis be answerable to the people. That is, we need a presidential form of government of the Union. In the republics, I think the republics should sort things out for themselves. The Russian republic, in our view, has formed quite a strong team. The other republics will also create one.

[Demonstrator] We end up with some absurdities. You understand, we say that everything belongs to the people, but now we are saying that, excuse me, everyone has to find his own way to clamber out of what has happened, regardless of the conditions he has been living in. If you look at the essence of it, the government in which Comrade Ryzhkov has participated has brought us to poverty. After all, there are 40 million people, or is it more?

[Simonov] Forty million.

[Demonstrator] Let's say 40 million below the poverty line, and they will end up even poorer.

[Demonstrator] I think it is ridiculous that we have gathered here today. The demonstration is organized by the authorities! That is, when they are seeking power, when the elections were in the offing, all this was understandable and quite purposeful; but now, when the authorities call for rallies, that goes to show that they are powerless, they are helpless, they do not have real power.

[Demonstrator] What have we started doing? Pulling down our own house! Instead of alongside—seeing that the house is old and ramshackle—we should have started building a new house, you understand? We are uneconomical and no one is taking charge. We are adopting bunches of laws now, but for what? We do not have the basic living cells from which the whole organism of society can be built. Laws have to be adopted in line with having someone in charge, but we do not have that so far. [end recording]

[Announcer] A rally has started in the past few minutes in Moscow. Taking part are several tens of thousands of people. The meeting was opened by Gavriil Popov, chairman of the Moscow City Soviet. Among the speakers are USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputies.

Demonstrators Interviewed

LD1609180590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Video report by L. Kushnarenko from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The control room has just told us that the item on the Moscow demonstration is ready. Here it is: [Video opens with long view over crowd of demonstrators; closer view of several banners reading: Yes to the Yeltsin and Gorbachev Program, No to the Program of Ryzhkov's Union Government; 500 Days; Give the Moscow City Soviet the Benefit of the Doubt]

[Kushnarenko] Those who came to the meeting demanded the resignation of the USSR Government headed by Ryzhkov. Supporting the reform policy of Gorbachev and Yeltsin, the demonstrators called for the program of getting the country out of crisis over 500 Days to be adopted. From the sidelines it is probably difficult to understand why the Union government, putting forward one program after another to improve the people's life, has lost its trust.

[Unidentified woman] The demand is for the resignation of the government because over five years there is nothing, absolutely no improvement.

[Kushnarenko, over view of crowd gathered in square] USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputies and Moscow's leaders spoke at the 50th Anniversary of the USSR Square. The demands were as before, if with a few reservations, but all the same, unaccustomed ones—it is (?up to us) to change the government.

[Unidentified man] I do not think the whole government is to blame. Some of them could be kept.

[Kushnarenko] What exactly is it that has discredited the government?

[Unidentified woman] You just have to look at our shops; that is enough for everything to become clear.

[Unidentified man] If you collect together all the articles published in our newspapers about the activities of our government, then it definitely ought to resign. This government has made more mistakes than have ever been seen before. All the decisions that they made before may have looked good, but for some reason they have turned into terrible things, you understand; everything has ended up in failure.

[Kushnarenko] This demonstration has been the biggest popular manifestation throughout the time of perestroyka.

Militia Says 70,000 Attended

LD1609183890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1735 GMT 16 Sep 90

[TASS correspondents Aleksandras Budris and Pavel Osrov report]

[Text] Moscow, 16 Sep—Despite the rainy fall weather, tens of thousands of Muscovites responded to the call of the Moscow electors' association and a number of other social organizations to take part in a demonstration and rally in the center of Moscow.

People's Deputy of the Russian Federation Lev Ponomarev, one of the organizers of the demonstration, told TASS that the main aim of the event was to declare Muscovites' support for the economy's transition to market relations, elaborated by the group of Academician Shatalin. This program is also known under the name of 500 Days or Gorbachev-Yeltsin program.

The demonstrators proceeded along the beltway to Manezh Square near the Kremlin where a rally took place in the evening in which peoples deputies of the USSR and Russia took part. Its participants adopted a resolution calling for the immediate resignation of the Union government, the formation of a new Democratic government, the urgent adoption of the 500 Days program, and called for support for the leadership of the city soviets of Moscow and Leningrad. It was also possible to see at the rally banners of an anti-perestroyka nature, including slogans insulting the honor and dignity of the USSR president.

The difficult task of guaranteeing order during the demonstration lay upon the shoulders of the Moscow Militia. "We do not intervene in the political content of the demonstration, but are responsible for order," General Petr Bogdanov, USSR deputy minister of internal affairs and chief of the Main Directorate of Internal Affairs of the Moscow Executive Committee, said in an interview with the TASS correspondents. "We and the organizers understand each other and they help us, pay heed to us, and we too try to meet their reasonable requests."

According to the assessment of the Moscow Militia, over 70,000 people were present at the rally. In his words, the situation was "calm and normal."

Aim for 'Civilized Communication'

LD1609214290 Moscow TASS in English 2101 GMT 16 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Aksenev]

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—"To initiate a tradition of civilized communication between citizens and politicians" was the aim of a festival held by the Russian Social Democratic Party in Moscow's central park on culture and recreation on Sunday.

A party presidium member, Oleg Rumyantsev, addressed the gathering.

A festival of this kind is a novelty in Russia even at this time of political upheaval. None of the Russian political parties has yet organised anything of this sort.

The festival's initiators planned to tell Muscovites about the party's view on the key issues of society's political, economic and intellectual life and invite them to debate these issues.

Entertainments were also on the agenda: Leading performers and groups appeared before audiences in various parts of the park and a rare contest of public speakers was held.

Despite cloudy and even rainy weather, groups of people engaged in lively discussions, a worker from Smolensk taking the stand after a people's deputy and a student polemicising with a professor.

The scope and range of opinions was impressive, and speakers preferred to stick to parliamentary etiquette. Most speakers focused on way of putting the country's economy on a market basis.

Social Democrats mainly favored the strategy proposed by the group headed by economist Stanislav Shatalin, but their central concern was how to ensure social protection of the population.

The Social Democratic festival attracted the attention of other newly-formed parties. Members of the Russian Democratic Party took part in debates. The festival was attended by Ukrainian Social Democrats and members of other parties.

Russian Social Democrats were greeted by an envoy from Swedish Social Democrats, Ingrdi Neslund.

Parliamentary Social Democrats Sergey Belozertsev, Aleksandr Obolensky and Nikolay Sazonov and a group of Russian parliament members participated in the festival.

The Russian Social Democratic Party was founded in May 1990. Its organisations and groups are now active in more than 100 cities and residential areas of the Russian Federation. The party membership is put at 10,000.

Value of Demonstration Questioned

PM1609195190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

["Own Information" report: "Rally in Moscow"]

[Text] A rally called on the initiative of a number of "democratic movements" including the Interregional Deputies Group was held in Moscow yesterday. [16 September]

The declared aim of this demonstration, which began at 1700 hours near Gorkiy Park and ended on Manezh Square, was to state the intolerability of the situation prevailing in the country's economy, demand immediate and resolute measures to establish order, and advocate the union of all supporters of the market economy.

However, the tenor of the rally was better judged not from its organizers' statements but from the slogans heard yesterday on Manezh Square and displayed on the large number of banners: "No to the Ryzhkov-Abalkin economic program" and "We demand the adoption of the Russian '500 Days' program!"

The question is: How can the country's most complex economic problems be resolved during a procession many kilometers long followed by a rally? Of course many speakers delivered passionate speeches. But do rallies really resolve problems of ownership, the land code, inflation, and the rise in prices...? Are the streets the place to decide which program for the transition to the market is better when neither housewives nor by any means all deputies are familiar with these documents?

Actions of this kind are a means of pressuring the USSR Supreme Soviet which is right now examining various concepts of the economic reform. The demand for the resignation of the government, which was voiced in almost every speech, confirms that. Replacing the government is easy, of course, but if you consult with people on this question it should not be done at rallies. Otherwise what happens is that those with most free time are the ones who speak on behalf of the whole people.

Here is another thought that springs to mind: Even the most able government will not be able to do anything if it has to work in a democracy based on rallies where everyone says how to work but few want to observe discipline and order. Any economic program will fail in these conditions even if rallies of many thousands of people act in its defense every day.

Moscow's Popov Discusses Purpose of Demonstration

LD1609093190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Text] A demonstration will be held at Moscow's Gorkiy Park at 1700 today. Our correspondent Lidiya Sechenova invited Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov, the chairman of the Moscow Soviet, into the studio.

[Sechenova] Gavriil Kharitonovich, first of all I want to say that we are very glad to see you in our studio. We do not hear the mayor of Moscow on Mayak all that often. But I want to ask you a question about the event that will take place this evening. I am a Muscovite and I live in the center of the city. I do not know whether I should go to this meeting or not. I am a little worried about it, so I do not want to go very much.

[Popov] That is quite logical. Thousands of people are thinking the same way as you. After all, we are still living in a state which is only beginning to build democracy. Democracy presupposes normal cooperation between two sides, the forces of law and order and the demonstrators themselves. But we in our country are all too inclined to lapse into extremism although, admittedly, we have learned a lot from previous meetings and demonstrations. Now we have far more restraint and discipline. Unfortunately, this demonstration is also being accompanied by certain rumors, that there will be calls at this demonstration for the president's resignation. There are rumors going round that the demonstrators will be urged to march on Red Square or Dzerzhinskiy Square. I want to tell you that this has nothing in common with reality. We have a very clear-cut task. The organizers of the demonstration have set an unambiguous objective, and it is with these slogans in mind that permission for the demonstration has actually been granted.

What has to be done at this demonstration? We see a progressive glimmer of hope now flickering in the country. This hope is represented for all of us by the Gorbachev-Yeltsin bloc.

[Sechenova] Yes.

[Popov] Here we have finally seen something that allows us to have some hope for the future. Therefore, we want to actively support this bloc. That is the first thing, to support the Gorbachev-Yeltsin plan. Second, the Supreme Soviet has now begun its work. Just see what difficulties this new session is encountering. It has been sitting and debating for an entire week. There has been no progress. Technical difficulties keep cropping up. Papers turn up missing. Reports have not been distributed. This is clear evidence of a wish to obstruct this bloc, to prevent it from functioning vigorously. Therefore, our second task is to tell those who intend to go on stalling, without making progress, that the people cannot wait any longer.

Our third objective is quite specific. We consider the resignation of the government to be the concentrated embodiment of the fact that changes must be made in the country. In its various forms, this government has now been governing us for a long time. Everything that is being done in the country is directly related to its efforts.

[Sechenova] Should we not wait a bit longer?

[Popov] Of course we can wait, but why should we? If you go into the shops, you see that they are all empty. So, why should we wait? If half the shelves were full and half empty, we could wait and see what happens to the half-empty shelves. But when you see that they are already completely empty, there is absolutely no point in waiting.

Or take the harvest. This year it is supposed to be the biggest ever, but we do not see or feel any of it. And what about this money that will not buy anything any longer? No matter where you turn, there is nothing to be seen. There is no time to wait.

[Sechenova] I would like to return to today's meeting. What if suddenly some, let us say, extremist provocations occur? How are the people going to be protected?

[Popov] I think that... I think that....

[Sechenova] Have you thought about this?

[Popov] Of course we have thought about this. Under no circumstances should people give into any extremist appeals to break, smash, remove, and so on. We have called a meeting. The organizing committee has asked some people to make speeches at the meeting. These are prominent figures in the country, deputies and other people. We will adopt a resolution at the meeting, and that is all that will happen.

There will be no so-called marches to break and smash things. Generally speaking, irrespective of good intentions and no matter how necessary they are, calls to break, smash, and remove things are from another epoch.

When we tried to resolve the problems in our country in such a way 50 or 70 years ago, we did not resolve them. We only opened the flood-gates of new problems.

It is time to start living in a cultured country—to demand, defend, and struggle, but to do all this by democratic means.

When I say that everyone has to make a choice, this means the decision should be made by taking into account all the factors of a democratic state and by choosing the relevant forms and methods of action. Nevertheless, first and foremost, the actions should be carried out in a humane way, if I may use a very simple phrase.

[Sechenova] Thank you.

Popov on Need for New Government

LD1509210190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Studio interview with Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov, chairman of the Moscow Soviet, by unidentified announcer; from the "Vremya" newscast—live]

[Text] [Popov] Good evening, esteemed viewers. The Moscow City Executive Committee has given permission for a demonstration by Muscovites tomorrow. The slogans will be in support of the Gorbachev-Yeltsin plan and of the switch to the market. At the same time rumors are being put about that the demonstration will be directed against the country's president. There are, of course, extremists both among the radicals and members of the CPSU, but the vast majority of people in our country now are convinced that only a bloc, a left-center bloc, is capable of saving the country from the looming crisis. We are indeed demanding a resignation—not of the president, however, but of the country's Council of Ministers.

[Announcer] But is it really necessary to raise the resignation issue in such a way at the present time? After all, public opinion is not united on this.

[Popov] Well let us think back to the first Congress [of USSR People's Deputies]. The government was endorsed without a perestroyka program. A plan was submitted at the second Congress but then the government itself abandoned it. In the spring of this year yet another plan was submitted and now the Supreme Soviet is objecting to it. Is this sequence a matter of chance? No, I do not think so. The present government neither had nor has a plan for switching to a genuine market, nor does it want to have one, for the simple reason that it is opposed to a genuine market.

Further, they say that the Council of Ministers must be left alone because difficulties within the country are increasing. Yet the difficulties were caused by the previous activities of that Council of Ministers. Or else they say that enterprises should be allowed to sign contracts for the new year. In the Moscow Soviet we have cupboards stuffed with these contracts, but one-third of the meat stipulated by them has not been delivered to us. Sometimes they say we should let them sort out other problems such as the harvest. We suggested to the government that it declare a state of emergency across the country and gather the harvest, saving billions of dollars, but the government failed to assume responsibility. It ought to be replaced by a different government—by a government the people can trust, a government all the republics trust, a government that has the trust of all those abroad who would like to help us. That is why at tomorrow's rally we shall appeal to the country's Supreme Soviet for a decision on the government's resignation.

You see, we are fed up. We are fed up with empty shops and money that is losing its value. We do not want any more crises, no cigarette crises, soap crises. We are concerned for the Gorbachev-Yeltsin plan. Things really cannot go on like this, which indeed is why we are taking to the streets to finally change the situation.

[Announcer] And the last question: Rumors are becoming ever more persistent in the capital about a tough, cold, and hungry winter. Can you dispel our apprehensions?

[Popov] It really will be a tough winter. Extraordinary problems have to be resolved and it would simply be completely dangerous to somehow quell people's concern. But the reason we are demanding changes in the country is to be sure that we are not alone in doing something to change the situation, that all bodies at every level are thinking only about helping the people get out of the tough situation we now find ourselves in.

Popov Backs Protest

AU1609140490 Paris AFP in English 0937 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, Sept 16 (AFP) — Residents of Moscow have been called to a public demonstration Sunday [16 September] to press for radical economic reforms and for the resignation of the government of Prime Minister Nikolai Ryzkhov.

Moscow's progressive mayor, Gavriil Popov, lent his support to the protest on public television Saturday. "We are tired of empty shops and money without value," he said.

The demonstration has been called for 5 p.m. (1300 GMT) by various reformist political groups and is scheduled to end under the walls of the Kremlin.

The call for radical economic reform here coincides with a serious meat shortage, one of a series of shortages that has gripped the Soviet capital.

Commenting on this, the pro-government newspaper IZVESTIYA said Sunday: "We are not only the victims of the tobacco crisis, the bread crisis and the meat crisis, but also the witnesses of the agonies of the distribution system."

Two weeks ago there was a severe bread shortage. This was almost unprecedented, since for years bread had one of the few products available in abundance.

But Muscovites did not stage angry demonstrations. Rather, they stood patiently in long lines as they are accustomed to do for many other products. The bread shortage ended after a few days, to be replaced by the meat shortage.

Mr. Popov said Saturday that the government had never had any real plans to switch to a market economy, had no such plans now and did not want any.

Moscow's mayor is a supporter of the so-called Yeltsin-Gorbachev plan for radical economic reform, which was drawn up by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and the president of the Russian Federation, Boris Yeltsin.

But the prime minister has urged a more moderate reform plan, which he claimed in a television interview represented a more realistic transition to a market economy.

"I want to avoid chaos in all areas of our lives, and I support social guarantees for the people," he said, adding that it was up to parliament to decide whether he retained the public confidence.

Parliament is due to choose one of several alternative economic plans before October 1. Essentially, they have a choice between the Yeltsin-Gorbachev plan, and that of Mr. Ryzkhov's government.

'Unconstitutional' Gorbachev Decree Suspended

LD1409124190 Moscow TASS in English 1233 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—The Soviet Constitutional Compliance Committee has ruled unconstitutional President Mikhail Gorbachev's decree removing the right to allow rallies in central Moscow from the city council and giving it to the government.

The decree empowered the Council of Ministers to decide on whether or not to permit specific rallies within Moscow's garden ring road. Previously, Soviet legislation gave the final say on such matters to the presidiums of republican parliaments and local governing councils.

The committee said in a statement issued here that the presidential decree "narrowed territorially the powers of the legislative bodies of the Russian Republic and the Moscow city council."

Citing the law on constitutional compliance in the USSR, the committee added that the decree was at odds with the constitution and "shall be suspended pending the removal of the discrepancy."

Concern Expressed Over 'Legality'

LD1409145190 Moscow TASS in English 1432 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—The Soviet Constitutional Compliance Committee "is proclaiming itself as a depoliticized body", chairman of the committee Sergey Aleksayev told a press conference in Moscow today. He said the committee's main task was to ensure the observance of the Soviet Constitution.

Alekseyev expressed concern over the state of legality in the country and in the Union republics. He said "it is high time to endorse the statehood of Union republics". He noted with regret that the committee's work to appraise acts, adopted in the republics, is practically paralysed.

Alekseyev declared, specifically, that the constitutional compliance committee had ruled unconstitutional President Gorbachev's decree removing the right to allow rallies in central Moscow from the city council and giving it to the government.

Asked by TASS correspondent about Gorbachev's reaction, Alekseyev said: "I believe the president professes ideals of a law-governed state."

'Radical' Leaders Discuss Meeting with Gorbachev

90UN2793A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 24 Aug 90 p 4

[Report on interview with Larisa Piyasheva, candidate of economic sciences, by Andrey Lapik; date and place not given: "Why Does Gorbachev Need the Radicals?"]

[Text] **At the end of July, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met with representatives of the left radical wing of Moscow's intelligentsia—prominent economists, publicists, and political scientists. Participating in the conversation were Vasiliy Selyunin, Anatoliy Strelyanyy, Larisa Piyasheva, Nikolay Shmelev, Otto Latsis, Pavel Bunin, Igor Klyamkin, Yuriy Chernichenko.... There was talk was about the pace and quality of economic reforms, and the governmental concept of the transition to a regulated market economy was discussed.**

Judging by reports in the press, the meeting occurred in a confidential atmosphere and it was of a consolidating nature. However the main question—why Gorbachev needed the "radicals"—still remained unanswered.

We turned for comments to one of the participants in the meeting, to Larisa Piyasheva, a candidate of economic sciences.

[Piyasheva] This meeting was a surprise for me. I received a telephone call the day before and I was invited to the Kremlin. Gorbachev appeared at exactly 1200 hours with members of the Presidential Council Yakovlev and Primakov, who remained silent the whole time and who scrutinized us attentively.

We sat at a table and worked with a short break until about 1800 hours. Everyone had an opportunity to tell his president what he deemed necessary.

Gorbachev listened attentively to all of our ideas regarding the radicalization of reforms. Some of the statements were formulated in a rather tough way. Thus, for example, Vasiliy Selyunin said that the last presidential ukase on disarming national military formations could push the country into a civil war. But in that event, all of the talk about a market economy becomes absolutely senseless.

[Lapik] How did Gorbachev react to this statement?

[Piyasheva] He said nothing. He became thoughtful for a minute and turned the conversation to a Polish theme. As I understood it, this question greatly interests Gorbachev. Apparently he counted on the use of the Polish experience, but they are reporting to him that Balcerowicz's reforms have failed.

Selyunin and I have just returned from Poland where we went especially to see everything with our own eyes. We met with prominent economists and with employees of the State Bank and the Ministry of Finance, and we analyzed the condition of the consumer market.

The Poles have already succeeded in resolving some of the problems today—for example, the food problem. It is apparent that certain complications arose in the course of reforms, but first and foremost they arose because of the fault of the government.

Balcerowicz's principal mistake, in my opinion, was inconsistency. After freeing prices the government froze salaries, which of course could not stop inflation, and it only distorted this process. Privatization was not extended to industrial enterprises, having affected only the sphere of services and trade. Therefore the structural perestroyka of the Polish economy is being delayed, and unemployment is becoming stagnant....

I have the overall impression from the meeting that the president has poor information facilities and inadequate analytical services. For example, he relies on sociological polls according to which more than 40 percent of the population prefers a low but stable salary to an opportunity to earn a good salary under conditions of risk. He cited this as evidence that the country is not ready for a transition to the market. But this is an obvious mistake of the analysts and of Gorbachev himself. A society cannot exist normally that consists of nothing but entrepreneurs.

And another example. In summoning all of us to unity and consolidation, which is absolutely correct and necessary, Gorbachev sees this process in the possibility of creating a certain "compromise" variant of a program that will include all of the positive "grains" from already existing variants. His experts did not take on the work of reporting to the president such a simple idea that this is virtually impossible. Just as it is impossible collectively to compose a symphony or to paint a picture, it is impossible also to combine the formulas of different economic schools in a single program. The socialists have one program, the social democrats have another program, and the liberals have yet another program.

In his time, Erhard accomplished the "economic miracle" precisely because the ideological and economic paradigm changed radically. It is precisely in this way that Reagan and Thatcher conducted their anti-inflationary policy, and they stabilized the economic situation in their countries because they did well in choosing their economic advisers from the monetarist camp.

[Lapik] Does this mean that it was "suggested" to Gorbachev that he define his sympathies?

[Piyasheva] A fact remains a fact: In official meetings inside the walls of the Kremlin Gorbachev has heard the demand repeated over and over again that the government be dismissed. It has lost trust completely, and it is not in a condition to carry out reforms. Any program that he proposes, even an extremely radical one, will provoke rejection and will be doomed to failure.

[Lapik] The words of Igor Klyamkin are well-known: The political time of this government has passed—it can be prolonged only owing to the political time of the president. Will Gorbachev shield Ryzhkov with his authority, or will he sacrifice the figure of prime minister in order to win the whole party?

[Piyasheva] More likely the second. At least, I am firmly convinced that Gorbachev is also ready for a change of government and for the radicalization of reforms. And this meeting can be viewed as the first step toward a dialogue with the liberal intelligentsia.

I would like the president to define himself decisively and to move over to our camp. In the final analysis he must understand that the "rightists" will never forgive his "opportunism," and that the position of leader of the democratic forces will not remain vacant for long. The situation is shifting to the side of Yeltsin who is gaining points with each new decision, and Gorbachev correspondingly is losing them.

Of course, it is not a question that Gorbachev is better than Yeltsin or vice-versa. I want to say that if radical reforms are not started on a Union level, then they will begin to be conducted on the republic level. And then we will not be able to avoid conflicts and a split in the democratic camp itself. And this is the most frightening thing today. We do not need either the Romanian version or the Chinese version. And this is exactly what Gorbachev talked about.

He said that perestroyka has run up against the opposition of virtually all strata of society. In fact, only the democrats have remained its consistent supporters to the end.

The conservatives have expressed their attitude toward perestroyka rather clearly: They are against the market choice and they are against radical reforms in general.

The middle managerial levels, in whose hands quite a lot of authority is concentrated, at first perceived very positively what Gorbachev started to do. They hoped that as a result of economic reforms their enterprises would receive independence from ministries and that they would be able to do whatever they wanted locally. But nobody thought that there would be talk of a transition to a new model of development which contemplated freedom, independence, and economic responsibility for everyone. As soon as they sensed this, they immediately began to retreat from perestroyka and to impede it.

But Gorbachev's most basic fear is that the workers and peasants have stopped supporting perestroyka. They are all frightened by the market which they interpret only as price increases, inflation, and unemployment.

In Gorbachev's opinion, only a consolidation of all democratic forces will ensure an intellectual breakthrough out of this situation.

[Lapik] But what is to be done with the "socialist choice," fidelity to which our president continues to emphasize?

[Piyasheva] The word "socialism" was not mentioned once by Gorbachev during the meeting. I think that if he decides on reforms that it is most likely that he will choose the tactic of silence. And this is correct: The only prohibition that should accompany reform is a prohibition on the use of the words "socialism" and "capitalism." A play on words will only lead us into a dead end. And I said this to the president.

The stage of reanimation of socialism and giving it a "human face" and a "second breath" is over. We have experimented enough with various kinds of models. It is time to return to the high road of civilization. The name of the new historical period is the "democratic breakthrough," the contents of which are reform of property, land use, and the financial and banking system....

[Lapik] Did your statement find support among your colleagues?

[Piyasheva] As for Selyunin and Strelyanyy, we are solid. Nikolay Shmelev said that I do not feel sorry for the president, that I dare to tell him the whole truth, but that he is not ready for it yet.

However, the differences of the economists who were present at the meeting mainly concerned the strategy of reforming. One way or another they all expressed themselves in favor of speeding up the transition to a market. And, as I understood it, we received a social order to develop a program of specific actions.

[Lapik] Was the question of the future of the CPSU discussed at the meeting?

[Piyasheva] No, but probably Gorbachev senses that life has already left these structures and that there is no future for them.

[Lapik] And still, when is Gorbachev sincere: when he talks with you or when he appears before the party functionaries?

[Piyasheva] I think that he is always sincere. Gorbachev is a brilliant politician. He is able to cooperate with everyone, and in the end he gets everyone to work for him. It was necessary for him to win and charm our audience, and he succeeded in doing this. He immediately sensed the tenor of our conversation. He spoke calmly, quietly, and confidently. And it became clear that he invited us not to express his dissatisfaction with our overly loud voices which impede the conduct of his reform. He really wanted to hear us out and to understand.

Today he is ready for radical actions. And apparently the rule of the game is that we will talk about this for everyone to hear.

[Lapik] After he lost the initiative last year, Gorbachev was late all the time: He came out against presidential power, against federation, and against private property. Is he able to regain the initiative today? How much time, in your opinion, has history allotted to Gorbachev?

[Piyasheva] Gorbachev's authority has an adequate reserve of durability. But time is really pressing. A political strike has been declared for 11 August: The miners gave the president one month to resolve the issue with the government.

Let us suppose that we slip by August if the miners are persuaded not to take to the streets. This can be done by Yeltsin, who also does not need strikes now. But then there is the following period, September, when the government submits its program which I fear is already doomed. Therefore there is nothing left for Gorbachev but to find himself another premier so that an alternative program can be presented by the new leader as early as September.

[Lapik] Whom do you intend for the position of prime minister?

[Piyasheva] In any event, the individual must be an experienced and competent economist who understands how a market economy functions. Perhaps Nikolay Shmelev or Vasiliy Selyunin. However, I could be mistaken....

[Lapik] Especially since Gorbachev, as I understood it, did not tell you anything specific. By the way, this brings to mind the fact that he is playing his own game. I have heard this version: Gorbachev assembled the "democrats" in order to take advantage of their authority in the West and to reinforce his own reputation as a supporter of radical reforms, to get billions in credits, and to attempt once more to adjust the very system that we are rejecting....

[Piyasheva] But then why start perestroyka? I am confident that the power that Gorbachev acquired, after becoming head of the CPSU Central Committee in 1985, would be enough for the whole of his remaining life.

[Lapik] A revitalized socialism is better than one that is decrepit....

[Piyasheva] Well let us assume that is so and that Gorbachev is maneuvering once again. What then? The government's program will be announced in September. If it turns out to be untenable, neither the Americans nor the British will give credits to the Soviet Union. But they will not give them before September in any event.

It will not be possible to deceive anyone, and very soon all of the cards will be laid out and the situation will finally become apparent. It will become clear whether Gorbachev is stopping the reanimation of socialism, is retiring experiments with a "planned-market" economy with hybrid forms of private-state property, and whether he himself will take the lead in the liberal-democratic breakthrough. Or whether this currently vacant position will be assumed by someone else....

Ryzhkov Interviewed on Market Economy Proposals

LD1509203490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1745 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Interview with USSR premier N.I. Ryzhkov by V. Stefanov in Moscow on 15 September; "In the USSR Government" program—live or recorded]

[Text] [Stefanov] Nikolay Ivanovich, a meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers has just been held in this hall. I was told that the program for the switch to a market economy was discussed. Tell me please, what is the significance of today's review? Does it mean that the government's position and its approach to the formation of the mechanisms and structure of a socially orientated market has changed?

[Ryzhkov] Good evening, esteemed comrades. Unfortunately, for a number of reasons I was unable to give my address yesterday. Yes indeed, a meeting of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers has just ended here. It was attended by the chairmen of all the committees and all the ministers of the USSR. Today we examined the question of the switch to the market, bearing in mind the fact that on 1 September, as you know, the government finished its preparation of the program for the switch to the market, and that furthermore, on 11 September the president sent the Supreme Soviet an alternative version of the transition to the market, the one prepared by Academician Shatalin.

On Tuesday a meeting of the Supreme Soviet discussed these questions. Yesterday the committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet also had a very stormy discussion of the question. Therefore, taking account of all these discussions and the fact that new documents have appeared, we gathered today in the government cabinet to discuss these questions, to discuss how we are to proceed, and most important of all to analyze the situation which is now developing.

I have to tell you that the discussions were heated, very heated but businesslike as well. Our aim was, in spite of everything, to take another critical look at both programs and, as they say, to choose the most important elements which will help us extricate the economy from the situation it finds itself in at the moment. Therefore I for my part tried to get everybody to express their views on various questions, and most improtant of all to weigh up the consequences, the precise consequences of this or that step.

[Stefanov] To make a forecast?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, to make a forecast. That is the most important thing. Today we can argue to our heart's content about how the program is written, whether it is well written or badly written, about the number of pages in it. But the most important thing is to forecast the consequences. We must have a clear idea of what the consequences will be of every step which we take. We must know this.

After all, that is connected not with one name or another, not with a definite group of people—let us say academicians, other scientists, our esteemed scientists, specialists—but is connected with the lives of 300 million people of our populace. Therefore we cannot fail to discuss these questions. Perhaps they have to be discussed a further 10 times before some decision or other can be taken.

I would like to dwell only on some questions. The first is that the members of the government were united in the view that the program presented by the government is correct, and most importantly that it lives up to its name, as I said on Tuesday, of being a moderately radical program. It is not cut off from life. That is its greatest merit and it is namely from these positions which we consider that those radical changes have to be implemented.

Of course the speakers spoke, and the first of all the questions which is of concern to everyone is not about what we write in all the programs or about what envelope we wrap the idea up in, but today everybody is concerned about the fate of the Soviet Union, the fate of the state, what sort of state will there be—will it be a united state, or will it be something else? That is what concerns everybody today. We realize that we must have a united state, a federative state in which the republics will have great independence and sovereignty, the republics will be sovereign—the Union republics, the autonomous republics—and will be alloted great rights. But at the same time we will be united. And our salvation is in this alone, our strength is in this alone when we are united and are a united, powerful state. Well, that thread ran all the time through our entire session today.

The second question which the speakers also touched upon very seriously is the question that the situation which is evolving today could harm any program, that it is impossible to manage any program until the laws are executed, until discipline is imposed. Therefore we consider that those laws which have been adopted by the Supreme Soviet, those decisions which have been adopted by the Council of Ministers, those decrees which have been published and issued on behalf of the president of our country must be executed. That is the basis of the work both of today and of 1991.

We cannot make further progress without this, because only a few months remain to the New Year. If we now abandon these laws, with all their shortcomings and without putting new ones in their place, how will the state run its affairs? I do not see how a state which destroys one set of laws without putting new laws in their place can run its affairs. Incidentally, the same thing was said about the structure of administrative bodies. After all, many people got up today and said: It does not depend on us individually. But we have to creat new administrative bodies, a new structure in the country which will work. Then we can break up the old structure. If, however, we entirely break up the old structure without creating a new one, we could lose control of the country. A very complex situation could then ensue.

Among what I would describe as individual, specific questions of this kind, the question of workers in the agro-industrial complex was discussed in a very serious way today. These workers are very alarmed about the proposals which have been reflected in that program. There it is stated that subsidies for loss-making collective and state farms must be eliminated altogether by 1 January. In our country, 25 percent of the collective and state farms fall into that category. Just imagine what will happen if 25 percent of our collective and state farms are liquidated from the New Year onward. We also belive in sorting out their problems, but they have to be sorted out gradually. This cannot be done in a single day. This cannot be done in 100 days. It is a lengthy process. These farms should probably be used as a basis for creating smallholdings [fermerovskiye khozyaystva]. But a process has to be followed. It cannot be done by force. There have to be certain prerequisites for this—economic and psychological prerequisites.

Incidentally, a very great deal was said about the psychological factor, that we write very nicely about all this but we do not take people's psychology into consideraiton. After all, this is a very complex process. Ultimately we are doing all this for the people. You can change the government, but the people cannot be changed. Therefore, whatever we do we must always be mindful of the people, ask ourselves whether the people understand what we are proposing, whether people are prepared for this, and whether our citizens are prepared for this. So very great concern was expressed about agriculture and I share this concern. This question must be approached very carefully.

Great concern was also voiced over the country's basic industries. Among these I would single out our coal industry for special attention. If the proposals to eliminate subsidies for enterprises from 1 January onward, which are being made, are accepted, then... I was advised today that of the 500 mines which there are in our country today, no less than 120 mines would in general....

[Stefanov] ...have to be closed.

[Ryzhkov] ...have to be closed. Well 120 mines means 270,000 workers.

That means 100 million tonnes of coal which they are extracting. So evidently we cannot take such decisions. These are very dangerous decisions. I understand that we have to abolish the subsidies—they are tormenting us economically—but we certainly must approach these matters very judiciously. And a number of further problems were raised which are connected with the transition to the market. I shall not deal with them all. I can say just one thing: that whatever we might do to create a healthier financial situation—and financial improvement is necessary, this is in both programs, and we cannot live without it—we must always remember that we have the new social programs which have been adopted such as the pensions law, or the decisions on assistance for large families, assistance for children.

We must on no account forget these programs. But if we are going to launch an offensive against these programs, then I for example will not take that on. And naturally, at the session of the government, the question... not only these questions connected with the transition to the market were raised. Of course very great concern is being expressed about the functioning of the national economy in the fourth quarter. That is natural, it would have been impossible to hold the conference today without that.

I want to say that the government has now been compelled—compelled literally to become involved in all spheres of the vital activity of the national economy. I have already said that we have put Comrade Voronin, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, in charge of this work. He occupies himself only with this. We have to ensure without fail the efficiency of light industry, the motor industry, the food industry. We must on no account allow any disruption with food products—at least of essential foods. Well, all this is now in hand, and I think here decisions have got to be taken not only in the center but also in the localities. The situation is very serious, and this is due primarily to the fact that communications have broken down. Discipline is very low. Just look at what is happening with meat deliveries to the city of Moscow. Yes, the question is often asked why in eight months Moscow has been supplied with only 89 percent of its meat; in other words, a shortfall of 11 percent in meat deliveries. Who is delivering short? The Russian Federation is delivering short. Belorussia. And meat deliveries to Leningrad have amounted to only 73 percent, 61 percent of that from Russia.

We are receiving telegrams from Sverdlovsk, from Chelyabinsk, and other industrial areas which set us the question of taking measures. And we are obliged now, although in many ways the economy of the republics ought to deal with that matter, but we are obliged now to become involved in order to take such measures to correct the situation. Of course the harvest is our concern, so there will also be great talk on the fourth quarter. And when it got round to a discussion of the market, of course particular attention was given to 1991. This is the year in which we practically will go over the market, though it be the first steps of the transition to the market, but that is a special year.

I have said already many times that preparations for 1991 are proceeding very slowly, but I want to say to everybody that two days ago I took to the president of the country a decree on preserving all economic links for 1991 at the level of 1990. If we do not do that we could end up in a most serious situation.

Therefore the governmment will take every measure to ensure that the economic links for 1991 are preserved and we will not stop short of anything here, neither of administrative measures nor of any economic measures. In my opinion, that alone will save 1991 because otherwise we could end up in a most difficult situation.

That is approximately what was discussed today at the sitting of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers of the USSR. On the whole the talk was very sharp, but I would say constructive.

[Stefanov] Nikolay Ivanovich, recently the government constantly is being subjected to criticism, including even demands for resignation. What is your attitude to these demands, to this criticism? On the whole, after all, you do not look like those people who simply hold on to their jobs for the sake of some kind of thoughts about their careers. What, in that case, makes you persistently carry out your policy nevertheless?

[Ryzhkov] It is a rather complex question because it concerns the government and concerns me as the head of the government in the first place. I think that there are two reasons here. The first is that, objectively speaking, the situation in the economy has worsened recently, and therefore it cannot but affect the people's moods, their attitude to the government. They consider that the government is not working through to the end in this instance, although in my report on Tuesday I said that unfortunately the center syndrome exists in our country, that everything which is not done is done by the center.

In any case this is of course connected with the work of the government, and it is difficult to add to this. The situation in the economy is, indeed, very difficult and the government can be and clearly should be criticized. By the way, I told the ministers this today.

But at the same time I think that the criticism of the government and of me personally, especially during the last several months, stems a great deal from the government's principled stand on some very important issues in the life of our people. That is why the criticism is sometimes, I would say, putting it mildly, too cruel because of our principled positions. Sometimes it goes beyond the limit of human relations. I take the view that, in present-day life, such an attitude should not exist and should not happen. I think that it has nothing to do with personalities. It appears that the political line the government has adopted does not appeal to somebody.

You know that I always speak out in favor of preserving our state. And I will go on saying this irrespective of what happens to me. I am for the prevention of chaos in any form of the country's life, to guarantee the social protection of our people, so that in the process of the transition to the market economy we would not hit too hard at the lower-paid, pensioners, and students. Therefore we should not be subjected to the so-called shock therapy, but instead go through the transition gradually. Somebody does not seem to like this. We are thought of as not being radical enough.

That is why I cannot agree when we are accused of conservatism. I am convinced that the moderate radicalism we are implementing is what is necessary for the country today.

The government is ready for discussion on any issue, to adopt any decision.

I would like to say yet again that the government is accountable to the people. It is accountable to the Supreme Soviet, and when the government and head of government are under such pressure from all sides this passes all bounds. You know, sometimes I would like to say something. Looking for enemies of perestroyka is for me associated somehow with our past days. It is a very dangerous thing. There is no need to look for enemies of perestroyka. There is a need for holding a constructive conversation, for persuading one another and finding solutions of some kind. This, I think, is what is most important.

Of course any government would like to have the confidence of the people and the decisions it takes and those it puts into effect to be popular amongst the people. Unfortunately, however, it is the fate of government to have to adopt measures that are not popular as well. And such a combination, when we adopt unpopular measures and a situation is developing, all this leaves a certain mark.

On Tuesday when I made my report at the Supreme Soviet I said clearly that the Supreme Soviet had appointed us and the Supreme Soviet must state its attitude toward us. If it has confidence in the government, the government will carry on working and carrying out its functions. If it does not have that confidence, the Supreme Soviet has the possibility of taking a decision. Ultimately it is the Supreme Soviet that appointed this government. Well, as far as Ryzhkov is concerned, I have defended and always will defend those positions in which I believe. And well, to speak frankly, if my credo is to look truth in the face and to work for what I believe in. I simply cannot do otherwise, I cannot. That is my life's credo. And I have always adhered firmly to these positions. Therefore I tell both you and the television viewers quite frankly about the situation which has developed around the government. Of course it is very difficult for the government to work in such a situation, very difficult. But I hope that the times will change.

[Stefanov] Nikolay Ivanovich, thank you for your interview.

[Ryzhkov] Thank you. All the best, comrades.

PRAVDA Reports 13 Sep Politburo Session

PM1509210590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Politburo: The Party and Reform"]

[Text] There was a session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo 13 September. It was attended by Politburo members, first secretaries of Union republic Communist Party Central Committees, and CPSU Central Committee secretaries.

The first question raised by the chairman—M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee—was on the problems of the routine CPSU Central Committee plenum. The plenum will be held in an atmosphere of intensive search for the optimum practical ways to achieve a radical reform of the economy which is now under way in society. It should help Communists elaborate a position on the most vital problems of the new, decisive, and at the same time—from the economic and sociopolitical viewpoint—exceptionally complex stage of perestroyka and also answer the acute and topical questions of the party's development and the activity of party committees and organizations since the 28th CPSU Congress.

Speakers proposed that the fundamental question on the party's work in conditions of implementing the program for the stabilization of the country's economy and the transition to the market be put at the top of the plenum agenda.

A lively discussion began on this question at the Politburo session. To ensure a deeper and more comprehensive discussion of this important problem at the plenum it was noted that it is necessary to acquaint CPSU Central Committee members promptly with the documents on the problems of transferring the economy to market relations. Speakers persistently stressed the idea that when reorganizing the economy, it is necessary to give the working man maximum protection, and that party organizations should give priority to questions of stabilizing the situation and people's social protection. It was noted that for us the market is not an end in itself but first and foremost a means of improving the country's economic position and improving people's well being. This must be explained to the masses intelligently and convincingly, and people's doubts must be removed said Yu.A. Prokofyev and A.P. Rubiks, among others.

S.I. Gurenko, A.N. Mutalibov, and others stressed the need at this stage for the all-around strengthening of order and organization in all spheres of economic life as the most important condition for achieving success, preserving the existing economic ties, and adopting radical measures to remove as soon as possible the urgent situation in supplying people with foodstuffs and prime necessities in a number of places.

N.A. Nazarbayev drew attention to the fact that it is important to more closely link questions of the transition to the market economy with the preparation of the Union Treaty. Other wishes were expressed which will be reflected in the Central Committee plenum's materials.

Participants in the session proposed that M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, deliver a report at the plenum.

After an exchange of opinions, Politburo members and CPSU Central Committee secretaries came to the conclusion that the plenum should be held in early October.

It was also decided that questions of organizing the work of the CPSU Central Committee, the creation of Central Committee commissions, the structure of the CPSU Central Committee apparatus, Communists' activity in soviets, and some other items be examined by the plenum.

Speaking about the composition and activity of CPSU Central Committee commissions as well as the structure and staffs of the Central Committee apparatus, V.A. Kuptsov placed the main emphasis on the fact that in view of the party's present functions and its financial position, it is best not just to reduce the apparatus and eliminate superfluous links but also make it more effective, flexible, and efficient. Speakers noted that the party apparatus must meet those high demands which the 28th CPSU Congress formulated. When forming the apparatus, account must be taken of the actual conditions and specifics in which various party committees and organizations are operating. We are striving to become a party of civic accord, G.V. Semenova said, and work with women's movements will help us to achieve this accord. She suggested that leaders of Union republic Communist Parties increase the attention paid by Central Committees to this area of work.

The idea was also expressed at the session that staffs be drawn up not so much on the basis of the number of workers as of their skills, vision of the future, and ability to work with people. To resolve this question it is planned to allocate only the wages fund for the upkeep of the apparatus without assigning staffs in minute detail. This will make it possible to use the available manpower more effectively and involve specialists from various fields in the work of the Central Committee apparatus while reducing its overall size. A.S. Dzasokhov expressed the idea that it is expedient to involve competent and knowledgeable Communists on social principles in the work of party committees and organizations.

Proposals on commissions covering areas of the Central Committee's activity were examined. Speakers noted the importance of the active work of CPSU Central Committee members in commissions, the creation of the conditions necessary for this, and the organizational and technical support for their activity by the apparatus. Proposals on the personnel of the commissions will also be presented for discussion and approval at the next CPSU Central Committee plenum.

O.S. Shenin delivered a report on Communists' activity in soviets. Unfortunately, he said, the party still has no well-oiled mechanisms for work in the soviets. Party groups' past experience in soviets and social organizations is no longer relevant. There must be new, modern approaches corresponding to the specific situation in each soviet. Communists must be united by a consciousness of their duty to the electors and a desire to discharge their obligations as deputies more effectively using the potential of party contact and the help of party organizations. Here it is necessary to proceed from the premise that a group's prestige will be created by its resourceful and constructive work in a soviet and by the bold way in which it raises the questions that concern people.

What practical innovations have there been and are there in this respect both at the center and locally, and what is the thrust of future productive quests? The session had a keen discussion on this question, too. V.V. Gidaspov, I.K. Polozkov, I.T. Frolov, K. Makhkamov, and other participants gave their ideas and proposals.

In conclusion, M.S. Gorbachev summed up the results of the discussion at the session and also reported to Politburo members and CPSU Central Committee secretaries on the meeting with U.S. President Bush in Helsinki and the talks held there.

Dzasokhov Interviewed on 13 Sep Politburo Meeting

LD1409214590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Interview with A.S. Dzasokhov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, by correspondent V. Stefanov; place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—live or recorded]

[Text] [Stefanov] Aleksandr Sergeyevich, first of all I would like to ask a question which is not directly related to the subject matter of the Politburo meeting. The fact is that this was the first meeting of the Politburo in its new composition.

[Dzasokhov] It is very apposite that you should have mentioned the composition of the Politburo. We now have with us the leaders of republican party organizations, and their participation enriches the debate in a significant and irreplaceable way. Together with the fact that the party itself and the whole of our society are now passing through processes in the economic sphere and in the political sphere which I would describe as certainly not easy—indeed as complicated—this led to the Politburo discussion on tasks currently facing the party being exacting and demanding.

Our attention was focussed above all on bringing up to date the way we participate and the methods and forms by which we act to implement the decisions adopted by the congress, particularly in the economic sphere, with a view to reaching a practical vision of relations in a regulated market. The party's concern is to assist the soviets and all state structures to tackle this task, and at the same time to seek to move this program forward at least cost to the majority of the population and to make this process as painless as possible. We spoke a great deal and in specific terms about the need for party organizations to play their part in working out the stipulations of the Union treaty and to do so with commitment and by bringing to it living contemporary ideas. Let me say that any ideas whatsoever, even those which have been thoroughly thought through, are difficult to put into practice unless the essential stable preconditions have been created as a starting position for achieving particular aims.

[Stefanov] Aleksandr Sergeyevich, what do you mean by saying: preparing the essential starting preconditions. I understand the words as preparing the society for the forthcoming serious changes.

[Dzasokhov] There are very many components here, but nevertheless I would put first and foremost our mutual interest in stabilizing the economy. There were speeches expressing the greatest concern at the Politburo meeting because there are in this sphere even elements of chaos, a great number of shortcomings, and even recurrences of somewhat primitive forms of natural goods exchange. We should eliminate all this and relieve our present day from these forms of activity that do little good to our cause.

Second, though it may be placed also as first priority, come the problems of political stability.

We are determined to implement all the decisions in the interests of the Soviet people fully within the framework of the constitution and the new laws engendered by the Soviet and republican parliaments.

[Stefanov] Also discussed at the Politburo meeting was the activity of the party in the new circumstances that you have just outlined which demands the renovation of the party itself.

[Dzasokhov] Sometimes we are criticized for being too much occupied by internal party matters. We do comprehend such criticisms, especially when they are justified.

We have now predominantly been talking about our tasks, the tasks which concern the entire Soviet people and the Soviet state. But I must tell you that we have serious intentions of bringing up to date the forms of activity of the party itself. With that end in view, we intend and proceed on the basis that a plenum of the Central Committee will take place in the first 10 days of October, at which there will be scope to discuss both the new commissions and the further improvement of the apparatus, including the Central Committee. Incidentally, the latter has been thoroughly compressed: it has been reduced by 40 percent numerically against precongress levels. And moreover, we are disposed—and this disposition must be transferred to a practical plane—to cooperate with all socio-political forces whose actions are channelled within the framework of perestroyka and of our ideas—which I would say have been arrived at the hard way—about the qualitative renewal of the whole sphere of the life and activity of our state for many years to come.

Legal Expert Criticizes Draft KGB Law

PM1409134490 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 36, 16-23 Sep 90 p 14

[Article by Nataliya Gevorkyan citing Doctor of Laws Aleskandr Larin: "Draft Law on the KGB Leaves Citizens Unprotected"—first three paragraphs are introduction; last two paragraphs are concluding editorial comment]

[Text] Hearing the acronym KGB makes many of our citizens uneasy; for one thing his organization has for decades remained secretive. People feel totally unprotected from it (not without reason), unaware of the limits of power and never knowing if these limits are exceeded. Besides, all attempts to protect individual rights in court are vain.

There is no doubt whatever that a law on the KGB (or to be precise, a law on the state security of the USSR) has become necessary due to our democratization process. So it is important what this law is going to be. To date only a draft of the law exists. Notably, it has been prepared by the State Security bodies themselves.

MN observer Nataliya Gevorkyan asked Aleksandr Larin, LLD, to comment on the draft. His views would be of interest to MPs who are going to discuss and pass such a law.

The bill, including its preamble, says much about the powers of the KGB, its bodies and its officials. Citizens are said to have duties, not rights.

For example, Article 4 says that citizens of the USSR have the duty "to cooperate with the KGB of the USSR, the bodies and troops subordinated to it in carrying out their mission of fighting crime". This means informing on one's next door neighbours may be a citizen's duty. What if he refuses? In this case, the draft provides for "responsibility of conformity with the law", i.e. enforce compliance. These norms are typical of a police state, not a state based on the rule of law, as we are aiming towards.

The bill provides for the right of the KGB "to monitor mail, telephone conversations and other communications", etc.—that is to examine correspondence and tap wires. Let me note that this does not apply to investigation but to routine work which is supposed to be done with no grounds for filing a criminal case and given ephemeral information.

As for the use of administrative measures, the KGB officers, according to the bill, should have the right "to summon persons violating the established order to the premises of the state security bodies and other organizations to explain their conduct." Failing to comply, "the above persons can be brought to the premises by compulsion". It follows from the article that person is regarded as a violator and possible victim of compulsive measures even before his explanations are heard. The case in point can perhaps be an inadvertent action, a misunderstanding rather than a crime. More than that, those who drafted the bill think that someone not even suspected of committing a crime can be detained for three or even ten days if he carries no identity papers. This is when, in civilized countries, a person can be taken into custody for questioning only in the course of criminal procedures. In all other cases law and order bodies never summon citizens, instead they visit them in their homes to take a statement, and that only if the citizens agree to do so.

At the same time, the drafters of the bill have lost sight of some aspects of KGB activities that considerably affect human rights and need to be regulated by law.

It is known for example that the KGB gives clearance for the employment of persons in jobs with access to secret information, for the issue of passports to travel abroad, etc. Taking this into account, the future law should provide for the right of citizens to know of any grounds for restricting their rights so that they could appeal against such decisions in court.

Many KGB powers are outlined vaguely in the bill.

For example, protection of the USSR's sovereignty and constitutional order, its economic and defence potential are listed among the tasks of the KGB. In fact these are the tasks to be tackled first and foremost by the Soviets of People's Deputies, the army and navy and the foreign ministry. Can such legal provisions preclude the KGB's dangerous interference in the functions of the supreme bodies of power, economic management and other agencies? Or might they encourage such interference?

There is vagueness in Article 6, which lists among the functions of the KGB the detection and elimination of "dangerous forms of organized crime". Any crime that is a threat to society. No one can precisely define what organized crime is. It's hard to argue against the view that all premeditated crimes committed by at least two persons are organized. This definition covers many crimes usually investigated by criminal investigation and socialist property embezzlement investigators, officers of procurator's offices and the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Therefore, granting the KGB the powers to deal with organized crime would give it leave to interfere in affairs that are within the legal competence of other investigatory bodies.

Article 6 also proposes to charge the KGB with "participation in ensuring safety... of Soviet citizens abroad." It is not clear on which grounds a Soviet arm of power can operate in other countries, which measures it would be able to take in this respect, whether Soviet citizens are required to ask for or agree to such protection, or at least whether they will be informed abut it, etc.

The bill proposes to make use of "open and covert means and methods" in routine efforts to uncover, prevent or stop crimes. What kind of methods? Does this include attacks by KGB officers on marchers under the guise of members of the "indignant public"?

The bill also envisages "technical operations" to be carried out by the KGB on request from the militia and prosecution bodies.... What the draft has in mind, perhaps, is that neither the militia nor the prosecuting bodies have the KGB's sophisticated technical equipment. But what kind of equipment is it? How may its use affect our citizens' lawful interests? How can these interests be protected?

Article 16 of the bill grants the KGB the right "to carry out work to prevent crime in line with the laws of the USSR". There are no such laws so far. Until recently, what the KGB considered as prevention of crime were threatening summons to report to KGB headquarters, firing people from their jobs, forced emigration, exile with no court sentence, etc. Are we sure that the same "prevention" methods are not being proposed now? And if not the above methods, which other ones?

Article 32 deals with the KGB's "special expenditure". It does not specify.

The absence of clear explanation of these and similar matters is fraught with bias and arbitrariness—things we are fed up with. Besides, omissions and vagueness generate false rumours that sap people's faith in the law.

The bill provides for powers which I think the KGB would rather dispense with.

For example, the KGB's duty is to guard and protect the heads of Soviet state and government, to provide them with classified communication services. As a result the country's leaders find themselves dependent on the agency which, among other things, runs four military services of its own: border guards, government communications, engineers and special troops. In the U.S., for example, presidential guards aren't subordinate to the National Security Department, and this causes no problems.

The KGB has the right of preliminary investigation. The bill retains this right. In the meantime the considerably smaller investigative apparatus of the KGB is under constant pressure from the far more numerous essential operational services closely linked with the party and state leadership. This is one of the reasons for illegal persecutions on political grounds. To solve the problem it is necessary to scrap the KGB's investigative apparatus and give this job to an independent body for preliminary investigations—an investigative committee.

The bill sets out to perpetuate the present position, in which the KGB runs archives of all sorts of information obtained by its various bodies and military services. These include, among other materials, files of past criminal investigations. Unlike other court files, they aren't kept in court house archives but on KGB premises. This makes it extremely hard for defence lawyers to study these materials and hence to rehabilitate those convicted without guilt. I think this is totally unjustified, such files should be retained in the court which passed the sentence.

There should be legally specified terms for KGB archive materials being taken off the secret list and made available to researchers, journalists and authors.

"The KGB exercises control over its subordinate bodies directly or through the bodies of state security in the Union Republics." This formula seems out of keeping with the general tendency of the development of federative relations in this country. One would expect relations between the centre and the sovereign members of the federation, as regards state security, to have a different basis. Instead of control and subordination, there should be coordination, mutual assistance and exchange of information.

Would the Union of Autonomous Republics agree to create their own KGB state security bodies, specified by decisions taken by the KGB of the USSR, as the bill provides for? It is more natural to expect the KGB to limit itself to consultaiton in such matters, while the Republics should play a more decisive role.

For the same reasons, perhaps, the Republics would dismiss the blunt formula in Article 3: "All control, communication and clerical work is to be in Russian".

All this is evidence that the bill has to be radically revised in the spirit of new thinking that takes heed of human rights and the principles of freedom and social justice.

We would only add to what Aleksandr Larin said here that not only new thinking but also common sense call on us at long last to shed the absurd practice by which government agencies make their own laws. This refers to any agency and particularly to such a special agency as the KGB.

Reading the bill, you find yourself wondering if the country is really discussing the need for a fundamentally new concept of state security. Society knows only too well that this issue worries all who want to live in a democratic state guaranteeing human rights. People do not care what the Committee for State Security will be. This depends on what we mean by state security. This key question should be answered before the bill is drafted. Otherwise we'll have a new law on the old agency whose vices are obvious in the proposed bill.

Consultations on Union Treaty Held 14 Sep

LD1509131490 Moscow TASS in English 1203 GMT 15 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Vyacheslav Zenkovich]

[Text] Moscow September 15 TASS—The leaders of Soviet autonomous republics and representatives of the Soviet parliament and the Council of Ministers held consultations in the Kremlin on Friday to discuss the drafting of a new Union treaty.

Opening the meeting, Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet parliament's Council of Nationalities, spoke about results of preliminary consultations with representatives of 12 constituent republics and further steps to prepare a Union treaty.

It was said at the meeting that "efforts to prepare this major document require fundamentally new approaches that would take into account republics' sovereignty declarations and other legislative acts reflecting people's hopes for real national and state independence."

Nishanov emphasised that "this process also requires the participation of autonomous republics."

Cholera Outbreak Reported in Rostov Area

90P50095 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 7

[Article by V. But: "New Case of Cholera"]

[Text] A case of cholera was recently discovered in the village of Koluzaevo not far from Rostov on the Don. The focus of infection was successfully localized. The cholera did not spread among the people who were relaxing at the country's well known Stavropol spring, but the doctors had to labor hard to prevent this. Nevertheless, a new case was recorded: a husband and wife fell ill in the densely populated Vorochilovskiy Rayon of Rostov. Many people have come in contact with them. They are now under observation. The doctors took drastic measures in order to prevent the spread of the disease. They have experience in doing this. Unfortunately cases of cholera have occured in Rostov before and more than once. They coped with this successfully. For the time being doctors feel the situation is unpredictable and are afraid of an epidemic.

Leaders Sign Writer Sofronov's Obituary

PM1409151390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Sep 90 Second Edition p 6

[Obituary of writer Anatoliy Vladimirovich Sofronov]

[Excerpts] Soviet literature has suffered a heavy loss. Anatoliy Vladimirovich Sofronov, renowned Soviet writer, Hero of Socialist Labor, USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Prize winner, and participant in the Great Patriotic War, has died in his 80th year. [passage omitted]

[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, Ch.T. Aytmatov, Yu.V. Bondarev, Yu.N. Verchenko, N.N. Gubenko, A.S. Dzasokhov, B.N. Yeltsin, A.S. Kapto, V.V. Karpov, K.Yu. Lavrov, A.I. Lukyanov, A.A. Mikhaylov, S.V. Mikhalkov, I.K. Polozkov, V.G. Rasputin, N.N. Ryzhkov, I.S. Silayev, Yu.M. Solomin, V.T. Suslin, M.A. Ulyanov.

Economics

Aganbegyan's Compromise Economic Plan Published

AU1509133990 Paris AFP in English 1252 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, Sept 15 (AFP) (by Sylvie Lanteaume) — A compromise economic plan supported by President Mikhail Gorbachev calls for a radical move towards a market economy, while preserving a strong federal government.

A compromise plan put forward by Mr. Gorbachev's economic adviser, Abel Aganbeguyan, was published by INTERFAX Saturday.

The plan is a synthesis of the plan put forward by economist Ladislav Shatalin and that put forward earlier by Prime Minister Nikolai Ryzkhov, a plan almost universally rejected.

Mr. Shatalin's economic program, which calls for rapid freeing of prices and large-scale privatisation of industry, was drawn up over the summer by a group of economists acting under the joint chairmanship of Mr. Gorbachev and Russian Republic President Boris Yeltsin.

But the government compromise, while borrowing heavily from the Shatalin plan, excludes several key chapters dealing with relations between the federal government and the governents of the republics.

Most notably, a provision giving laws made by republics precedence over federal law has been removed from the government plan.

The passages were suppressed "on the direct orders of Mr. Gorbachev," Mr. Aganbeguyan said in presenting his compromise plan to parliamentary committees on Friday.

Mr. Gorbachev insisted that businesses be subject to taxes at both the federal and republican government level. He also insisted on preservation of the current governmental structures of the Soviet Union, Mr. Aganbeguyan said.

Mr. Shatalin's plan called for only republican taxation of businesses. The republics would then transfer part of their revenues to the federal government, a strategy imposing strict controls on the federal government.

Leonid Albalkin, deputy premier in charge of economic reform, said the government compromise calls for a faster transition to a market economy while maintaining state control over production volume and a slower freeing of prices.

The differences between the two plans are important.

The government compromise proposes devoting all of 1991 to stabilising the economic situation and reducing the budget deficit, while concrete measures would not be adopted until 1992.

Under the compromise, privatisation would take place gradually, depending on sectors concerned and value of the property.

Prices would be deregulated gradually, with increases first in the price of necessities such as bread, milk and meat balanced by social compensation programs.

The Shatalin plan proposed a three-month period to stabilise the economy, rapid privatisation and freeing some prices, while freezing prices for basic necessities in 1991.

The two plans come together on one important point: 70 to 80 per cent of prices would be deregulated by the end of 1991. They also agree more generally on the necessity of regarding the Soviet Union as a single market.

If the Supreme Soviet (parliament) and the republics adopt the Aganbeguyan compromise, the field of action for the federal government will still be greatly reduced in the macro-economic sphere, in controlling market infrastructures and social welfare programs.

Under the compromise, the federal government functions according to the powers granted it by the republics. Other elements remain to be added to the government plan, such as decreasing the budget deficit by 1991 by decreasing Soviet foreign aid expenditures by 75 per cent, and reducing the federal budget by 30 per cent.

Both plans called for decreasing the 1990 military budget of 70.9 billion rubles (113.4 billion dollars).

The government compromise would decrease military spending by five billion rubles, while the Shatalin plan would reduce it by 14 billion rubles.

'Top Priority' Program Reviews Economic Plans

LD1609165990 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 14 Sep 90

["Top Priority" program introduced by Sergey Goryachev, with Sergey Plekhanon, deputy director of the Institute of United States and Canada Studies, and Aleksey Kvasov, secretary in charge of research and planning at the Institute of United States and Canada Studies]

[Excerpts] [Goryachev] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to 'Top Priority.' I am Sergey Goryachev. The Soviet Union's industrial output dropped in August by 1.7 percent, which is this year's record slump. This was reported by the National Statistics Committee on Thursday. Economics is of top priority these days in this country. Crucial discussion is nowadays under way in the Supreme Soviet, which is the national parliament. Our parliament is expected to adopt a program of the country's transition to a market economy. In fact, there are two programs proposed. One is by the government, which is called the Ryzhkov program, because the prime minister is Nikolay Ryzhkov, and the other was worked out by a group of experts led by prominent economist Stanislav Shatalin—the Shatalin plan. I've invited two experts to discuss these plans and to compare them. Now let me introduce Sergey Plekhanov, who is the deputy director of the Institute of the United States and Canada Studies.

[Plekhanov] Hello.

[Goryachev] Aleksey Kvasov in charge of research and planning in the same institute. [passage omitted] I would like to ask what is your personal views on both of these plans, which is better for the nation, and which is healthier, which is more realistic. Sergey.

[Plekhanov] Well, I think right now there is already some kind of a compromise; not a compromise, actually, there is a joint plan which has been endorsed by President Gorbachev which is largely based on the Shatalin plan. The Shatalin plan has many advantages over the Ryzhkov plan. On the side of the Ryzhkov plan is caution and clinging to structures which are no longer operating. So the rationale behind it, that the central government should be in control of the process of transition, is questionable because the central government in the past year has demonstrated its inability to control anything in this society. In fact, the longer it clings to the centralized powers that it has inherited from the past, the deeper the crisis will be. So I think that the Shatalin plan, which puts more trust in the ability of the republics' governments, the local governments, and enterprises themselves, to build this new economic system, I think is far more sound and it has greater credibility.

[Goryachev] Aleksey.

[Kvasov] Well, I think there are two unfortunate facts. One is that these two programs don't mix at all.

[Goryachev] The Ryzhkov plans and the...

[Kvasov interrupting] The 500 Days plan. And the second unfortunate fact is that no matter what plan would be adopted, the present government cannot be implementing it because it is not supported by the public. And to understand why it is not supported by the public you have to realize that, for example, during the first eight months of this year, according to my personal estimates, the inflation rate increased up to 15 percent, which means that to the end of this year the inflation would be 25 percent. [passage omitted]

[Goryachev] Well, let's talk about the Ryzhkov government once again. Don't you think, well, this plan is being criticized—the Ryzhkov—and you are very critical about this plan as well, but can it be so that the public does not like that plan because it is presented by the Ryzhkov government, because the Ryzhkov government failed to make their lives better, as it promised?

[Kyasov] Very much so.

[Goryachev] So probably, probably, don't you think that the attitude of the public has a very strong and probably too (?a strong mark) on the distrust, mistrust of the government.

[Plekhanov] Well, that's right. It's difficult to entrust your own fate to the people who have not been efficient in managing your fate or your nation's economy for the past couple of years. So no matter what the Ryzhkov government proposes, it bears a mark of people who have lead us to this sorry state, no matter what scapegoats they will be able to find; no matter whom they will blame, the people will be blaming the government. The other program has the benefit of not yet being tested and being brought by other people who have not yet been in government.

[Kvasov] Yes, I think we are witnessing a personal tragedy of Nikolay Ryzhkov himself. He is a very good person, he can be trusted in personal terms, but he was not very flexible, and he doesn't know how to play by the new and constantly changing rules.

[Goryachev] So you think the government will have to go eventually?

[Plekhanov] Yes, I think so.

[Kvasov] I also think so. [passage omitted]

[Goryachev] We have to wind up this program and you will have to tell me what you think this choice will be. The discussion we will see in the coming days, but what do you think this choice will be—the Ryzhkov program or the Shatalin program adopted by the national parliament? Aleksey.

[Kvasov] I think it will be the 500 days program, Shatalin's program, with some social-economic stabilisers.

[Goryachev] Taken from the government program?

[Kvasov] Or some new, just newly invented socioeconomic stabilizers, and put into that program.

[Goryachev] Sergey, your prediction.

[Plekhanov] I think it's not a question of endorsing a program, because Gorbachev has already endorsed the fundamentals of the Shatalin program. It's a question of who will be the next prime minister.

[Goryachev] Well, we'll see that in a matter of days, I suppose. That was 'Top Priority.'

Committee Reports on Absenteeism in Economy

LD1409154190 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Yeremakova]

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—Strikes and mass absenteeism due to ethnic and sociopolitical conflicts cost the Soviet economy ten million man-days in the first six months of 1990, the Soviet Statistics Committee reports. This was tantamount to 75,000 people failing to report to work every day, resulting in a production shortfall of nearly one billion roubles.

In addition, there were also authorised losses of the same kind, topping 124 million man-days.

Thousands of people were taken off their regular jobs and sent to the countryside to help farmers gather harvests or to short-handed agricultural produce storages to pre-package vetetables for shops.

More than 20 million man-days were spent to help on construction projects at the request of local authorities. Summons to military reserve registration offices, courts and other institutions devoured even more time.

Worker assistance to police in patrolling streets took another two million man-days from production, while work at children's summer camps sponsored by various organisations added up to more than seven million man-days.

Sports competitions and performing arts events staged during working hours cost over 1.5 million man-days.

Conferences and seminars not directly associated with an organisation's line of work resulted in the loss of 2.4 million man-days.

These and other forms of officially sanctioned absenteeism meant that 400,000 people were off their jobs daily last year.

But the situation is improving. In 1987, for instance, the number was 700,000.

Scientific

Cosmos-2100 Satellite Launched 14 Sep

PM1509184190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 90 Second Edition p 3

["Satellite Launched"]

[Text] Moscow, 14 Sep —"Cosmos-2100," another artificial earth satellite, was launched in the Soviet Union 14 September by the launch vehicle "Cosmos."

The satellite is carrying scientific apparatus for continuing the study of space.

The satellite has been put into orbit with the following parameters;
—initial period of rotation—104.9 minutes;
—maximum distance from earth's surface (apogee)—1,026 km;
—minimum distance from earth's surface (perigee)—978 km;
—angle of orbit—82.9 degrees.

In addition to scientific apparatus, the satellite is carrying a radio system for the precise measurement of orbital elements and a radiotelemetry system for transmitting to earth data produced by the instruments and scientific apparatus.

The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.

Soyuz Cosmonauts Continue Mission Experiments

LD1409151790 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—TASS correspondent reporting from the Mission Control Centre:

In the past two days Gennadiy Manakov and Gennadiy Strekalov conducted experiments in space materials science and geophysical research.

On September 12 the crew held a scheduled melting experiment on the Gallar device. The nine-day experiment involves growing a high-quality monocrystal of the semiconducting material hallium arsenide.

A set of videospectral equipment on the Kvant-2 module was used to take photographs of parts of Soviet territory. The main aim is to examine the state of Siberian woods in order to spot fire-hazardous areas. Information was promptly beamed back to earth.

The cosmonauts have unloaded the Progress M-4 spacecraft and loaded it with used equipment. Final operations in refuelling tanks of the station with fuel and oxidiser are being completed now.

According to telemetric information and reports of the crew, the on-board systems of the Mir complex function normally. The cosmonauts feel well.

Chernobyl Software 'Thieves' Erase Data

LD1409121690 Moscow TASS in English 1149 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kryzhanovskiy]

[Text] Minsk September 14 TASS—Vital data on the health of victims of the 1986 Chenobyl catastrophe, including information on over half a million people and on the radioactive contamination of 20,000 towns and villages, has been erased from software stolen from a Belorussian research institute. The software was stolen in spring from the Research Institute of Radiation Treatment.

While an investigation into the theft was going on, Belorussian doctors appealed to the thieves through the press not to wipe-off the data. However, their request was not heeded.

Militia General Litsian Sobolevskiy, who heads the inquest, told TASS that the thieves have now been arrested. They are all teenagers and committed the crime to make money. According to preliminary information, the data in the memory of the stolen computers and recorded on floppy discs had been erased. Technical experts are now engaged in a last-ditch effort to try to piece together as much information as possible from the wiped computer disks.

Research Ship Returns to Kaliningrad

LD1509223690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2100 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Summary] The scientific vessel Akademik Boris Petrov has returned to Kaliningrad after a three-month expedition. The ship is fitted with "unique" equipment for detecting insignificant amounts of caesium-133 and strontium-90 in the sea and on the sea-bed. According to expedition head V. Karpov, the voyage aimed to "work out new methods of remote monitoring of the presence of sea-based nuclear weapons using the unique Sapfir complex designed in our institute".

A study was also carried out on the ecological situation in sections of the Black, Mediterranean, North, and Barents Seas following the Chernobyl disaster. The findings make it possible to reach conclusions about Chernobyl's impact on the environment in those regions. The results have still to be analyzed in Moscow but it is already clear that radioactivity has increased in parts of the world ocean.

TASS To Publish 'Mysterious Phenomena' Bulletin

LD1409162290 Moscow TASS in English 1453 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Veronika Romanenkova]

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—Unidentified flying objects and poltergeists, the Bermuda Triangle and the snowman will be topics of a new bulletin "Anomaly" published by TASS and the "Ecology of the Unknown" Association. They will also be treated in the almanac "We and UFOs", put about by the scientific production firm "Compass-S". The presentation of these publications took place here today.

"The idea of publishing 'Anomaly' arose when public interest in several phenomena, which academic science dismissed as something devilish, borne of somebody's enflamed imagination, was at its height," the bulletin's editor, chief of TASS press bureau Sergey Bulantsev said. "These phenomena are not anomalies, because they occur everywhere and rather frequently. The word 'Anomaly' reflects not the essence of a phenomena that strikes out imagination, but our attitude to it."

The bulletin will publish many hypotheses, some quite extravagant, explaining mysterious phenomena.

The almanac "We and UFOs" will examine mysterious phenomena through the prism of practical experience with due account for stereotype thinking. Its authors will include prominent Soviet and foreign scientists. Both publications will be illustrated with unique photos.

"One must not believe or refuse to believe in UFOs," Bulantsev recomends his readers. "It is necessary to study the facts that may help an honest scholar get an insight into some yet unknown domains. Then a desire will arise to unravel difficult, but extremely fascinating phenomena".

Military

Moiseyev Discusses Issues Concerning Soviet Army

Collaboration With Ministries

LD1709101390 Moscow TASS in English 1003 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—"The Soviet defence minister makes no independent political decisions on international matters. This is the prerogative of top organs of state power," Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the Soviet General Staff, told TASS today. "But Soviet military leaders draw up proposals and corresponding substantiations for their adoption," he added.

Expounding on this point, Moiseyev said that representatives of the Defence Ministry collaborate closely with the Foreign Ministry, KGB and representatives of other ministries and departments in the process of elaborating proposals on various international matters. "Heated debates and clashes of views and opinions often occur at this level," Moiseyev stressed. He believes this is a natural process that contributes to the elaboration of realistic proposals.

In Moiseyev's view, a specific feature of this work is that the Defence Ministry today must tackle two, seemingly incompatible tasks. "On the one hand," he said, "we always bear direct responsibility for the country's defence and security. On the other—the present situation imperatively calls for disarmament."

According to Moiseyev, to solve these two tasks it is necessary to alter radically many concepts of security, to access in a new light a whole line of problems linked with the country's defence. "The top leadership pays due attention to our proposals, as is shown by the political decisions adopted," Moiseyev stressed.

Housing of Servicemen

90SV0034A Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK in Russian No 35, Aug 90 p 8

[Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and first deputy USSR minister of defense, responds to reader's letter: "Conclusions After a Withdrawal"]

[Text] "Recently there has been much talk about the lack of social security for the military. The situation with the availability of housing and the settlement of servicemen withdrawn from the countries of East Europe to the territory of the USSR is particularly alarming. I would like to ask: What is the USSR Ministry of Defense doing? Could it be that this powerful ministry with its budget of over 70 billion [rubles] is incapable of providing shelter and elementary amenities for a not-so-large number of people?"

[Signed] N. Perfilyeva, Magnitogorsk

Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and first deputy USSR minister of defense, responds:

Indeed, a difficult situation has developed with the availability of housing to servicemen. As of now we already have 173,600 "homeless" families. In addition to this there are 25,000 families of officers and warrant officers from units withdrawn from Hungary and Czechoslovakia; also, we are looking at pulling out two armor divisions from the GDR this year within the framework of carrying out the announced 500,000 reduction. Therefore the number of people comes out to be not all that small.

These troops are going to be stationed on the territory of 12 military districts. The Moscow, Belorussian, Kiev, and Volga-Ural Military Districts are facing the most extensive tasks in this regard.

Housing is the ultimate issue in virtually every garrison to which the troops are redeployed. We will be able to put up soldiers and sergeants without major problems. The necessary barracks stock is being prepared. In addition, we will build 32 barracks buildings for 4,300 personnel and seven mess halls for 5,000 personnel in 1990.

The situation is much more complicated as far as the families of officers and warrant officers are concerned. Why? First of all we should refer to the urgent raising of the issue of troop withdrawal and the extremely tight deadlines for carrying it out which are set out in relevant intergovernmental agreements. As they put it, the ink on these agreements was not yet dry when the first troop trains were already on the way to the Union. We did not actually have time for preparatory work. In principle, the one and a half years within which we must withdraw troops from Hungary and Czechoslovakia are an extremely short period of time for resolving the entire set of issues that arise in conjunction with this.

People are coming forward to rebuke us for failing to prepare for the redeployment of troops in advance, for intending to remain abroad for an infinitely long period. Obviously it would be proper to recall the following maxim here: "Everyone fancies himself a strategist while watching the battle from a distance." Hardly anyone could have foretold the timing of the very radical changes in the countries of East Europe.

Now about the specifics of what is being done by the Ministry of Defense with a view to solving the housing problem. We build about 70,000 apartments annually with our own resources. It would appear that we could fully meet the housing needs of our officers, warrant officers, and extended-service personnel within three years, four years at the most. However, even given this scope we are not in a position to accomplish this task single-handedly. What is the reason?

Tens of thousands of officers, warrant officers, and extended-service personnel are discharged from the Army annually due to length of service or other reasons. Last year alone more than 110,000 people were discharged to the reserves in conjunction with a cut. Eighty-five percent of them continue to reside on the territory of military settlements. More than 50,000 graduates of military schools come to these settlements annually to serve there. A majority of them already have families. Therefore new housing must also be built for them.

Where is the way out?

First of all it is planned to increase considerably the volume and pace of construction with the resources of the Ministry of Defense itself. In late April we submitted to the USSR Council of Ministers a draft target-oriented program of social services for servicemen which envisages, among other things, the construction of 436,000 apartments with a total floor space of 24 million square meters in 1991 through 1995, which is almost 25 percent more than in the current five-year plan. Of this, 1.5 million square meters, or 25,000 apartments are earmarked for servicemen withdrawn from units of the Central and Southern Groups of Forces. At present, virtually all of our construction capacity is put to use in erecting housing. However, it is necessary to resolve the issue of delivering prefabricated elements for housing construction to us from the national economy because at present our industrial facilities meet only 70 to 80 percent of our needs, despite the planned growth of capacity by a factor of 1.5 in the 13th Five Year Plan.

According to preliminary estimates, the overall need for capital investment in conjunction with the withdrawal of troops may exceed 800 million rubles [R]. In 1990, the volume of work associated with this will come to R100 million, out of which the USSR Ministry of Defense has secured R30 million within its budget and R70 million have been allocated additionally by a decree of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The issue of providing housing for servicemen cannot be resolved without the active participation of local soviets.

Unfortunately, in quite a few places they do not comply with the resolution of the government on the allocation of housing to cadre and discharged servicemen. The arrears of floor space due us by virtue of share participation amount to 5 million square meters.

The right to a dwelling is the most significant social right of an individual. However, in some places people's deputies forget that servicemen also have this right in full.

Thus on 25 June the Presidium of the Moscow Soviet resolved to suspend the allocation of dwelling space to the USSR Ministry of Defense, in this manner violating a resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers dated 8 September 1984. Certain problems have developed in Voronezh, Kemerovo, Kuybyshev, Tambov, and Chelyabinsk Oblasts, as well as in a number of oblasts of the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, and Kazakhstan. In these areas, local organs of power have set conditions that are hard to meet in the process of considering share transfers of the USSR Ministry of Defense for housing construction. A joint search for optimal solutions is under way.

The following is a legitimate question: How are the families of officers and warrant officers of the withdrawn units doing? Some of them have been put up temporarily in dormitories and hotels.

The structures of classroom buildings, headquarters, and barracks are being adapted for these purposes. The construction of dormitories made of modular wooden parts is under way. Seventeen residential buildings for 1,482 families have already been commissioned. In 1990 we will build a total of 54 residential buildings with 3,806 apartments, six dormitories for 1,065 people, as well as 196 dormitories with 3,900 rooms made of assembled wooden parts. According to our calculations, one-half of the families without apartments will be able to settle here, based on one room per family. Another 30 percent of the officers and warrant officers will return to the places of service where they have reserved dwelling space. The remaining 20 percent will have to rent apartments in the private sector. In keeping with a recently adopted government decree, it is established that servicemen will be compensated for payments for the premises rented of up to 90 rubles per month.

Naturally, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the countries of East Europe and Mongolia entails many other social problems. This includes job placement of family members of servicemen, schools, daycare centers and nurseries, and the provision of foodstuffs and consumer staples for the people.

The USSR Ministry of Defense is working on all these issues. I hope that they will be successfully resolved with the help of local soviet and party organs and the public. Taking care of soldiers cannot be considered strictly "an internal affair" of the Ministry of Defense. I would like to recall that the 28th CPSU Congress designated the reinforcement of the financial and social position of military cadres and the provision of housing with amenities for servicemen as priority tasks. This is an endeavor for all of society and the whole population.

Poll on Attitudes Toward Military Published

PM1409103090 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 36, 16-23 Sep 90 pp 8-9

["Social Barometer" opinion poll edited by Professor Yuriy Levada, part of a feature under the rubric "'MN' Research": "What Changes Can We Expect?"]

[Text] Findings of an all-Union opinion poll carried out by the All-Union Centre for the Study of Public Opinion in August 1990 in ten regions of the country. The poll covered roughly 1,000 persons; here is the preliminary data in percentages. [Editorial note—Russian-language version gives variant figures here supplied in parentheses after English-language version figures]

Is there a threat of military attack against the USSR today?

yes	12(12)
no	68(68)
don't know	21(12)

Is there a need to change our country's funding of the arms and munitions industry?

we should increase it	5.5 (6)
we should lower it	56 (56)
it should be left at the present level	21 (26)
hard to say	11.5(12)

What is you attitude toward the USSR Minstry of Defence being head by civilians?

positive	41(40)
negative	34(34)
hard to say	26(36)

Recently the Supreme Soviets in a number of Union republics passed decisions to the effect that their draftees must serve in the Army solely on the territory of their republic. Do you approve of these decisions?

approve and believe that all the Republics must act in the same way	48(47)
in principle I am not against such decisions, but this must not be done in some Republics	20(20)
I am in general against such decisions	20(20)
can't say anything definite	12(13)

How happy are you with the state of affairs in the Soviet armed forces?

happy	1 (3)
quite happy	5 (7)
a bit dissatisfied	43(42)
totally dissatisfied	36(33)
can't say for sure	15(15)

What do you believe primarily accounts for this unfavourable state things?

the Armed Forces' poor battleworthiness	9 (9)
the Army presents a threat to democratic process in the country	6 (6)
low discipline, lack of order in the Army	43(42)
growth of non-official and criminal activities	33(31)
the Army stupefies and morally cripples young people	19 (8)

How should discussion of the Army's problems proceed?

with the involvement of widespread public opinion	71(70)
this is up to specialists, civilians must not interfere	20(19)
can't say for sure	46(11)

How do you view the attitudes of top military leaders, judging by their speeches at party congresses and Congresses of People's Deputies?

progressive, forward-looking	7 (9)
conservative, backward	43(40)
can't say for sure	50(51)

Is this stand shared, in your opinion, by the majority of the Army by only a small part of it?

by the majority	9(10)
by a small part	39(38)
can't say for sure	52(52)

What would be your attitude towards the proposal to set up, under public control, special inter-republican military formations (simliar to UN "peace forces") to be used for the settlement of inter-ethnic conflicts on USSR territory?

positive	51(50)
negative	21(21)
can't say for sure	28(29)

Poll Findings Analyzed

PM1409113490 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 36, 16-23 Sep 90 pp 8-9

[Article by Yuriy Levada and Aleksey Levinson, part of a feature under the rubric "'MN' Research": "'Man With a Rifle': Pros and Cons"]

[Text] The situation in the Soviet Army, its role in our society today and tomorrow concern everybody, the military and civilians, democrats and "patriots", the young and the veterans. Attention is focussed on the assessment of the past from 1917 onwards, on the revolutionary and other forms of violence. Underlying it all is the main question: what can a "man with a rifle" give to society—or deprive it of.

We have been monitoring public opinion in this area. It is sometimes said that army problems are too delicate to be open to public debate. As is clear from the results of a recent survey undertaken by the All-Union Centre for the Study of Public Opinion, only a small minority support such a viewpoint. Accusations of "anti-army" sentiments seem to deter almost no one.

The Largest of 'Three Whales'

Of the three whales supporting totalitarian rule in this country—the party apparat, the secret police, and the army—the latter has always been the largest. The army is most closely integrated into mass consciousness and our way of life. Almost half the population receive "schooling" in army barracks—the model which has been promoted for decades as the paradigm of social development. Total militarization of public life and consciousness has damaged this country as gravely as the militarization of the economy. Of course the "extra load" of policing functions in internal emergency situations has prevented the army from performing its statutory defence mission, but we shall not discuss this here.

Unfortunately, the situation in the army that has been widely discussed in the press is not a thing of the past. The inertia, habits, and institutions of nationwide militancy still remain part and parcel of our life, but under much more complicated circumstances.

First, the very foundations of the "besieged fortress" mentality have been undermined. Not only is the "enemy image" disappearing, but also the concept of confrontation between our society and the rest of the world. As we know from previous polls whose results are borne out by the data published below, the overwhelming majority of the Soviet population today perceive no real military threat and see no need for maintaining military spending on the present level.

Second, the public are currently reviewing and reassessing many events in our own and our neighbours' history when military force played a decisive role, from intervention in Afghanistan and Czechoslovakia to the revolutionary terror back in 1918-1922. Successful military action often proved to have damaging political consequences.

Third, the situation in the army has deeply worried every social strata. Although some publicists and military leaders have alleged that if it had not been for MOSCOW NEWS' and OGONEK's revelations, no one would care about the nightmare of "hazing", about the ethnic conflicts and other "niceties" of army service; the data below clearly indicate what aspects of army life worry our citizens the most.

Some Points And the Credibility Crisis

You will note that only one per cent of the respondents are "happy" with the situation in Soviet Armed Forces. Almost 80 per cent see it as far from satisfactory.

The population are most concerned about lack of order in the army, about growing violence and crime, and the stupefying effect of army routine on young people. All three most popular answers imply criticism of the "barrack school of life". By now its methods have been widely covered by the press, but most people already know it well from practical experience. (Please note that respondents could tick off more than one possible answer, hence the sum total exceeding 100 percent.)

Not many people fear antidemocratic action from the army. There is much talk of a military coup in this country, but few people believe this is plausible. Anyway, for the time being all we have got are general data, not differentiated according to social or age groups. However, as is known from previous research, alarmist sentiment is concentrated amongst certain social groups depending directly on how well informed the respondents are.

Let us compare that with the attitudes to military leaders' public addresses. Only half the respondents chose to answer this question. A critical attitude is obviously predominant. The majority of those who answered believe that the leaders' conservatism is not shared by the majority of the army. A short time ago ARGUMENTARY I FAKTY published some very curious data on the position of Russian MPs who hold military posts. Apparently, their attitudes are directly related to their rank.

No wonder the army's credibility is falling, though more slowly than that of other institutions. Late last year, 44 percent of respondents said they trusted the army. In July 1990, only 35 percent. You may recall that "growing criticism of the army" was supported in July by 63 per cent of respondents (see MN No 30, July 29, 1990). Young people of call-up age have least confidence in the army, about twice lower than average. The better imformed and educated social groups are most critical in their attitudes.

Indispensable in an Emergency

In emergency situations—natural calamaties, mass unrest and violence—the army is invariably sent to the rescue first. Besides, soldiers can be found on building sites, assembly lines and harvesting combines.

Is that good or bad for society?

What other force is there to replace such a large, well-organized and uncomplaining workforce?

The fact that the army is indispensable in such situations is tragic for both them and society as a whole, since the army performs productive, emergency and policing functions alien to it, and performs them unprofessionally. And also because the army's role in emergencies is to stop the gaps due to mismanagement, inefficiency and irresponsibility, and thus it perpetuates the system which causes all this. Any forced labour is bad because it is inefficent, irrespective of whether it may be highly disciplined and unpaid.

Today the army has been called in to cope with another calamity, an extraordinarily rich harvest. Part of it will no doubt be saved by the army. But wouldn't it be better to send soldiers to their native farmsteads for the harvesting period, or better still, not to draft them at all from rural areas? Wouldn't they do a better job then?

The answer seems obvious, provided the farmsteads existed and the "freed men" were used to this type of work.... It all forms a vicious circle in which the army has played a not insignificant role—as the force used to dispossess the kulaks and demoralize the peasants, and as a channel for transferring the male work force from rural areas.

The issue of using military force in situations of social and ethnic unrest stands apart. A few months ago we pollsters tried to find out in which cases society is prepared to justify the use of force and firearms to establish order. It appeared that the majority of the population regarded forcible actions as lawful when taken against pogroms and mass violence, but not against demonstrations or rallies.

Now that we have data enough to analyze a whole series of punitive actions, we can conclude that apart from anything else, military intervention is ineffective on principle. It can restore a semblance of law and order, though temporarily. We do not know a single instance in which violence has helped to put out the flames of enmity rather than giving rise to another bout of violence.

The army's prestige has not been boosted by the decisions to use their services in Tbilisi, Baku and other zones of conflict in Transcaucasia. As one watches political developments in this region (taken at random), one tends to ask oneself: Who stands to lose? The answer is obvious: the army and those who have sent it there have suffered a strategic defeat akin to those suffered in Prague and Budapest earlier, or the defeat of the Polish army in its war against the Polish people....

The army could not have won because social and political problems cannot and ought not to be resolved by military means.

Is There an Alternative?

To break out of the vicious circle, the whole system of coordinates must be changed. To save the army's prestige, its social role must be reviewed. More accurately, its specific and irreplacable role must be identified—at least for the time being. In principle, this role is well known: to defend the nation rather than watch over it or stop the gaps in the economic and political machinery. In other words, the army must be able to serve society in a different way.

It is clear from the present poll that society is ready to ponder such an alternative.

Support is growing, for example, for the idea of setting up, under public control, "peace forces" which could be used to settle interethnic conflicts. It is worth contemplating the possibility of settling such conflicts exclusively by such forces, since no other state institutions seem to be able to do so nowadays.

Apparently, a large part of the population does not find the idea of appointing a civilian to the post of Defence Minister outrageous, although it is an outrage to the military establishment. It can be presumed that society would endorse the setting up of a civilian parliamentary committee on military affairs, although no question about this has so far been asked.

The impression is that there is a realistic alternative worth looking for amongst the present tangle of vicious circles.

Ulyanovsk Oblast Calls for Radar Site's Closure

PM0609132390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Sep 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by Colonel V. Voloskovets under the "Acute Situation" rubric: "Radar Operators Under Blockade"]

[Text] Ulyanovsk has really spread out recently. Housing districts have stretched out as far as the forests and outlying suburbs of years past. They have also reached the site of the radiotechnical subunit commanded by Officer V. Yevtushenko.

According to current criteria, the situation is perfectly normal: Such cases occurred also in the past, and the ensuing questions used to be resolved on the basis of mutually acceptable compromises, without conflicts. Initially, events in Ulyanovsk appeared to develop without complications.

An enlarged sitting of representatives of Ulyanovsk's soviet organs, the USSR Ministry of Defense, and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of Health on the question of relocating the subunit to a different rayon was held 12 January this year. An analysis of locations near Ulyanovsk showed that a new site, meeting the demands for deploying the subunit's installations, could be found 12 km to the north of the city.

A decision was adopted to speed up the construction and commissioning of buildings and facilities in the new rayon in 1991. But things appeared to go smoothly only on paper.... The designers (Moscow's "Promstroyproyekt" Institute) and the general contractors (the "Ulyanovskstroy" Territorial Association under the RSFSR Ministry of Construction in the Southern Regions) simply did not get down to work.

To make up for it, new resolutions and decisions appeared in the oblast, categorically demanding the radar station's relocation beyond the city limits. Where? Not a word about this in the resolutions. Matters were aggravated by material published in local mass media, bluntly saying that city residents will not be permitted to move into new homes until such time as the military cease irradiating the buildings. Understandably, the situation around the subunit started rapidly heating up. It even got as far as instances of subunit officers being insulted in the streets.

The unit's command sought ways to extricate itself from the situation without any detriment to combat readiness, but they all were rejected without being examined. A new resolution was adopted by the oblast authorities on 16 August. It no longer mentions any assurances about help from the oblast in building the new station. To make up for it, it contains the following ultimatum: "In parallel with seeking a site for relocating the station, the Ministry of Defense should examine the question of possibly closing the radar station down." The subunit commander was instructed "to dismantle sources of electromagnetic radiation" and the relevant city services were instructed "to disconnect the radar station from the city's power supply network." The subunit was forbidden to use its own power supply sources. A special commission was set up to monitor the resolution's fulfillment.

Not a single military specialist was present when the resolution was being elaborated, apart from the garrison prosecutor who thoroughly objected to the adoption of the illegal act. Were the persons exercising power aware of their decisions' consequences? Combat readiness is, to all intents and purposes, totally wrecked at the subunit today. The radar operators used their equipment for just over 11 hours during the last few months—only in emergencies. The situation with combat alert duty has become more complex. The provision of radar information for airmen and Rocket Forces servicemen is actually in jeopardy, as is the safety of aircraft flights. But the oblast authorities did not halt there. They cut off power supplies to the subunit and the barracks area. And yet, women and children are housed in that area.

I recently happened to visit the Ulyanovsk Oblispolkom [Oblast Soviet Executive Committee]. But there was no interview with Oblispolkom Chairman O. Kazarov. The chairman said curtly: No interviews until the radars are dismantled. And he added that he intends to set up a State Motor Vehicle Inspectorate checkpoint on the approach road to the subunit so as to finally put an end to diesel fuel deliveries for its own power sources.

The oblispolkom chairman displays determination. It might even win him the desired dividends from some quarters. Hardly likely, though. Ordinary working people are no politicians, but they are well aware what the Army means. They are also aware what the country's security means. People will figure out who really has the cause at heart and who—by pitting some against others—is covering up his own official incompetence.

Blockade.... This word can be heard increasingly often in Ulyanovsk. It sounds absurd when applied to a Soviet Army subunit suffering as a result of a decision by soviet authorities.

Baltic Republics

Latvia Protests Iraqi Presence in Baltic Fleet

AU1409112890 Paris AFP in English 1117 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, Sept 14 (AFP)—Latvia has protested the presence on its territory of Iraqi military personnel undergoing training with the Soviet Baltic Fleet, the daily KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reported Friday.

The Supreme Soviet (parliament) of the Baltic republic Thursday adopted a resolution "protesting vigourously against the stationing and training of military nationals of the Iraqi aggressor state on Latvian territory," the newspaper said.

A Latvian television broadcast Saturday reported that Iraqi military personnel were training aboard Baltic Fleet ships, but the number of personnel involved was not specified.

The Latvian parliament resolution demanded the departure of the Iraqi troops in line with the official condemnation of Iraq on August 3 by Latvia.

The commander of the Riga base, Sergey Sharov, confirmed to KOMSOMOLSKAYA that a "group of Iraqis specialising in the study of naval defensive aramaments was currently undergoing training at the base."

CPSU Politburo Issues Appeal to Lithuania

PM1509183590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Appeal of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Central Committee Politburo to Communists and the Lithuanian Population"]

[Text] Numerous appeals from citizens of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic continue to arrive at the CPSU Central Committee. They express concern both for their personal fate and for the fate of the republic. Particular anxiety is articulated in connection with the delay to the start of negotiations between representatives of the republic and the Union leadership.

In this connection the CPSU Central Committee Politburo considers it its duty to appeal to Communists and to all progressive forces of the republic to support the course proclaimed at the 28th CPSU Congress of radical renewal within all spheres of public life, to progress toward humane, democratic socialism, and a just and civilized resolution of any complex issue, including that regarding the national state arrangement of the USSR. We are convinced that this course may be implemented by the conclusion of a new Union treaty which would take account of the specific features and needs of all the republics, including, naturally, Lithuania. The treaty should guarantee the strict observance of civil rights, irrespective of ethnic affiliation and place of residence.

The CPSU Central Committe Politburo relates positively to the search undertaken by the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) toward the sovereign development of the republic within the makeup of the USSR. We do not see a contradication between independence and participation in the Union, built on law-based, democratic principles. There are ample grounds for supposing that the transition to a market economy will aid both the development of integrational processes and an increase in the independence of each subject of the future Union of sovereign states.

Expressing support for all the republic's healthy forces, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo places hope on the 21st Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU). The congress is to work out documents mobilizing Communists and the whole of the republic's society to the defense of social gains and to the implementation of the constructive program of perestroyka.

In the situation which has arisen, it is expedient to once again rethink ways out of the crisis which has formed in Lithuania, taking into account the prospects for the profound reform of our Union.

It is important to carry on affairs with complete awareness of responsibility, to demonstrate a balanced approach and realism, to persistently pursue a line of consolidating society, and to search for ways of resolving the problems on a democratic basis, while relying above all on the will and interests of the working people.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo appeals to all who hold Lithuania's future dear not to allow the further escalation of tension in the republic, the premeditated fanning of old grievances, and the distortion of the past, but to make a correct choice at this complex stage of historic development.

Landsbergis Responds to Appeal

LD1509222790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis spoke on Lithuanian television late this evening. He commented on the appeal received from the CPSU Politburo, which states that USSR citizens in Lithuania are concerned about the delay in starting negotiations between the Lithuanian Republic and the Union.

Vytautas Landsbergis noted that [words indistinct] preparations are in motion for something resembling what Estonia was told, that Lithuania is not a state and there will be no negotiations.

Vytautas Landsbergis said, that in spite of everything, the Kremlin's concern can also be detected. He recalled the words of the U.S. secretary of state, which were uttered following the resolution of the German question. The words concerning this were, and I quote: We are nearing official diplomatic relations with the three Baltic states.

Vytautas Landsbergis observed that the Kremlin would most likely booby-trap negotiations between Lithuania and the Union. He identified this as certain events taking place in east Lithuania, behind which stand that same CPSU and its Central Committee.

Vytautas Landsbergis pointed out it is not at all surprising that the CPCU Central Committee is supporting the Lithuanian Communist Party's efforts to restore and see Lithuania within the USSR structure.

Landsbergis Speaks to Lithuanian Industrialists

LD1509205890 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] The second conference of the Lithuanian Industrialists Association, which unites approximately 330 of the republic's enterprises, establishments, and organizations, opened in Vilnius today.

Administrators of ministries, departments, and other republic offices are participating.

Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis discussed current interaction between politics and the economy, industrial enterprise management, and social and other problems in his address.

In the afternoon, the delegates continued to deliberate directions of the Lithuanian Industrialists association's activity and the [word indistinct] of the republic's economic development. Association members spoke out against any type of management and criticized the increasing number of various departments, which, in their opinion, are attempting to centralize and monopolize management.

The industrialists urged the Lithuanian Supreme Council halt adoption of the Lithuanian State enterprise Law and prepare authoritatively a mechanism for transitioning state enterprises and organizations to private joint-stock enterprises.

Association members are prepared to participate actively in the law preparation work at the parliament and the government.

Leading organ elections were held. From three proposed candidates, Algimantas Matulevicius, general director of the Neringa Union and economic sciences candidate, was elected the new president of the Lithuanian Industrialists' Association.

Lithuania's Prunskiene Addresses Baltic Issues

AU1409172190 Frankfurt FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 14 Sep 90 p 2

[Report by Karl Grobe from Vilnius: "Chances Already Missed?"]

[Text] The chances for Lithuania's independence were better a few months ago than now. At the moment, the Kremlin is more than busy because of the Gulf crisis and the Germany policy. The "Baltic question" is not at the head of the agenda. This assessment was made by Lithuanian head of government Kazimiera Prunskiene.

Speaking to a group of German journalists in Vilnius this week, the Lithuanian premier also described the hopes that many of her fellow-citizens and also many deputies place in Russian President Boris Yeltsin. "Yeltsin wanted to support us and to recognize our independence. I have always been cautious in this respect, but others thought that his increased authority in dealing with Mikhail Gorbachev will make our position easier," she said.

Soviet President Gorbachev is interested in coordinating his policy with Yeltsin "because this reduces his problems," Mrs. Prunskiene thinks; Russian President Yeltsin is interested in cooperation with Gorbachev "because he does not have any military forces." The Armed Forces are loyal to Gorbachev, but they are orthodox and to the left of him, "between Gorbachev and Ligachev," the best known spokesman of the dogmatic party group. Formally, Mrs. Prunskiene said, the Army is subordinate to USSR head of government Ryzhkov. "He survived the crisis," she said, referring to the discussions in the parliaments of Russia and the Soviet Union on the economic reform.

Since the Lithuanian declaration of independence of 11 March, in which the republic proclaimed the continuation of the state sovereignty that existed before the forced annexation of 1939-40, the situation has changed considerably, in her view. Almost all Union republics have declared themselves independent—in various forms—"and other republics are interested in considering us in the same way as them."

In a recent telephone conversation Gorbachev told her that after 12 September—that is, after his summit meeting with U.S. President George Bush and the conclusion of the two-plus-four negotiations—the negotiations on the independence of the three Baltic republics (apart from Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia, which are coordinating their actions in the "Baltic Council" of the three republics) can be resumed, the head of government reported. "I do not have any reason to doubt his readiness for negotiations." The Baltic Council agrees that talks with Yeltsin alone—that is, circumventing the USSR headquarters—can only be fragmentary.

Mrs. Prunskiene outlined the goals of the negotiations in a spontaneous statement made in German:

1. Only full independence is possible; "for staying in the USSR we would not need negotiations."

2. Individual questions still have to be negotiated, for instance the units of the Soviet Army stationed in the Baltic republics ("We think that they should withdraw at the same time as they are withdrawing from the GDR").

The Federation Council, to which the heads of all Soviet republics belong and which advises the president, has "almost accepted this." And certainly some Union republics will not sign the new Union treaty, which Gorbachev has presented, in its current form. However, decisively more pressure has to be exerted. The Lithuanian Parliament, for instance, is adopting an all too indifferent attitude; however, the following is also correct: "We need negotiations, not a fight with Gorbachev."

Germany, too, is called upon to act, Mrs. Prunskiene stressed, because the annexation of Lithuania by the USSR was the direct consequence of the Hitler-Stalin pact. In her view, solving the Baltic question belongs to coming to terms with the consequences of World War II in the same way as the unification of Germany, which she welcomed expressly. Understandably, the Bonn government is interested in stabilizing the Soviet Union. But the injustice that was done to the Baltic states is the consequence of, among other things, German actions. Germany has to face up to this responsibility.

Shenin To Attend Lithuanian Party Congress

LD1409223990 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] The final stage of the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Lithuania begins in Vilnius tomorrow.

Oleg Shenin, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, has arrived to participate.

Today, the guest from Moscow, escorted by the Communist Party's representative in Lithuania, First Secretary Mykolas Burokevicius, visited Salcininkai Rayon.

In addressing the rayon party meeting, both high guests emphasized that Polish nationality residents have the right to establish a Polish national territorial unit within the Soviet Union's constituency.

In the meantime, the party's Politburo today issued an appeal to the Lithuanian people urging them not to augment tension in the republic.

Thus, an exhortation to make peace is issued in Moscow, while having arrived in Lithuania, a representative of that same party is attempting to pit the Poles against the Lithuanians.

Lithuanian Parliament Decries Criticism

90UN2794A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 14 Aug 90 p 2

["Statement of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council Presidium"]

[Text] The text of an appeal to the people of Lithuania on behalf of a group of intellectuals, which was carried in certain newspapers recently, seemingly reflects the unease and concern felt in society or a particular part of it. The nature of the negotiations with the USSR and the terms on which they will be conducted and whether we will approach them sufficiently prepared, steadfastly, and cohesively are being discussed extensively. The trials which have been our lot to this point have been beaten off thanks precisely to this. It is merely for this reason that there arises, in connection with the appeal, the legitimate question: Does it strengthen the position of the leadership of the Republic of Lithuania or not?

Attempts have been made to sow hostility between the Supreme Council and the government for several months now. To this end use has been made of mutual critical remarks, which are expressed as a matter of course, but which are immediately blown up with the aid of talk and rumor, differences in assignments and activity, people's personal attributes and, finally, suspicion, which is unfortunately pervasive in Lithuanian society. And given the emergence of a major conflict, a crisis even, new opportunities could be afforded for propaganda which is hostile to us in the world and for the plans of the president of a neighboring country to control a Lithuania allegedly disenchanted with the decisions of its freely elected parliament.

The appeal strictly differentiates between the highest authorities of the Republic of Lithuania—the parliament and the government—as does the evaluation of them. The Council of Ministers, whose activity is being subjected to pernicious denigration, and the Supreme Council, which is incessantly perpetrating this. It itself is portrayed as having done nothing useful other than contribute to the increased danger of the threat to Lithuania. For this reason the signatories, in no doubt as to the justice of these charges, are even now calling for thought to be given to new elections, even in circumvention of the constitution. There is talk of the onset of a dramatic decision-making moment, and moderate economic and social reforms are proposed.

There is a manifest lack of consistency here, and we may perhaps discern in this connection merely a position which [illegible] formerly to be overcome en route to 11 March. It remains merely to be regretted that a moment was chosen for the attack on the Supreme Council when it is preparing to lead two extraordinarily important sets of negotiations with the USSR and the Russian Federation. In a similar situation the Supreme Soviets of Latvia and Estonia experienced no fewer attempts aimed at disconnection and disparagement, and this, as can be seen, is a far from chance coincidence.

[Signed] V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council

[Dated] 2 August 1990, Vilnius

Lithuanian Deputies Continue To Draw USSR Pay

PM1409095390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[INTERFAX report: "Why Are They Being Paid?"]

[Text] According to a report in the Vilnius newspaper VALSTIECIU LAIKRASTIS (PEASANTS NEWSPAPER), USSR people's deputies from Lithuania are continuing to receive 200 rubles a month each from the Union parliament for their activity as deputies, even though they are not taking part in the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet in accordance with the resolution of the Lithuanian parliament. Citing Moscow sources, the newspaper claims that only Vitautas Landsbergis and Kazimiera Prunskiene have so far refused to draw their pay from the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Lithuanian Party Denies Seeking Revenge

90UN2794B Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 14 Aug 90 p 2

[Reprint of 11 August 1990 statement in TIESA by Vladimir Berezov, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee: "The Lithuanian Communist Party Does Not Aspire to Revenge"]

[Text] The debate in connection with the appeal signed by the fathers of "Sajudis" and some intellectuals has directly or indirectly affected the Lithuanian Communist Party. I would like, therefore, to express my position on this issue as secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. This is not easy since we could once again be tendentiously accused (this is already happening) of "splitting the nation," designs of ill intent and other such things. But nor is it possible to remain silent because our silence would be interpreted, all the same, in any way that might occur to our opponents.

Do not consider our position a fear of criticism, the more so in that the Lithuanian Communist Party has done things which merit criticism, particularly in its recent past, which we condemned at the 20th congress, and, having recorded in our program our aspiration to independence as a most important goal, we wish sincerely to participate in the creation of the new Lithuania. We have remained members of this party, despite the fact that some people have chosen an easier way—have left it. We have remained not because we thirst for revenge, of which we are constantly being accused, but to reorganize the Lithuanian Communist Party into a political organization of a democratic, parliamentary type whose activity might contribute to the establishment of an independent Lithuania and the creation of a law-based, democratic state. We believe that everyone has a right to serve this end, regardless of his past mistakes.

Deputies from the Lithuanian Communist Party merit criticism also, little has been presented in the way of proposals and draft laws, and work on the commissions is not being performed sufficiently openly. Following the parliamentary recess, we intend to prepare more constructive proposals and will aspire to parliamentary consensus on all possible issues. We are all obliged to learn parliamentary activity.

However, we are disturbed by the fact that, following the appearance of the said appeal, an extensive improper campaign, whose scale and focus are little by little betraying its organizational basis, has begun. We are not the authors of this statement, as LIETUVOS AIDAS maintains, but the intelligentsia's concern at the situation which has taken shape, which is expressed in the appeal, is comprehensible to us and is a legitimate, normal phenomenon in a pluralist society. We believe that neither a semi-official parliamentary newspaper, which is not, as distinct from many other publications, incidentally, distinguished by a diversity of opinion, despite the specious subtitle of "government newspaper," nor we members of parliament should be looking only for enemies—in the press, in the countryside, in the unions, among the intelligentsia. It is even being said that "the appeal is part of an action, coordinated internationally" (?!), which is linked with the occupation of Kuwait even. We believe that the leadership of the Supreme Council also should heed the criticism and not consider itself infallible. In this specific instance, possibly, it should have gotten together with the authors of the appeal and explained its standpoints, the outlook, and its view of certain problems, on such a matter as elections to the Seimas included. In keeping with the opinion of many people of Lithuania, a constructive view of the current situation and the possibilities for a solution of problems could have been shaped in this way.

We cannot agree with the attempts to take Lithuania back to the years of authoritarianism or stagnation, when a word of disagreement or an opinion contrary to that of the powers that be were punished by persecution, when social or political tension was created artificially and when "enemies of the people" were sought to cover up one's own political incompetence and mistakes.

We cannot agree with this and for this reason we express the firm intention to actively defend the freedom to display opinions, pluralism, and other sacred human rights in a democratic society, regardless of the kind of arguments employed in supporting the desire to limit them. We do not agree either with the following deliberate substitution of values: "first independence, then democracy." Independence without democracy could be a tool for the satisfaction of the egotistic purposes of people yearning for power. On the other hand, without democracy and political tolerance we will be unable to involve all people in the work on restoration of the state and, consequently, will not establish independence either.

We will endeavor to ensure that there be no procrastination concerning the start of negotiations with the USSR in order that laws regulating parliamentary activity, the law on the constitutional court and a permanent constitution be adopted as quickly as possible and that the principle of the separation of powers be realized. This does not mean that the Lithuanian Communist Party demands elections to the Seimas tomorrow, without waiting for the negotiations, and that we view parliament's activity only in a critical light. It means only one thing—that we deputies are not infallible and will not be here in the parliamentary palace forever and that we are ready, when the decision is made, to take part in free democratic elections.

Nonexistent blame is constantly being imputed to deputies of the Lithuanian Communist Party and its leaders, and various inventions are being circulated. Not one has yet been confirmed. However, some people are continuing to make a living out of this. We are convinced that the wave of political intolerance and primitive anticommunism which is being stoked and the new "witch hunt" are not approved by the people of Lithuania. And the independent Lithuanian Communist Party will continue to defend each citizen of our reviving state whom people attempt to persecute for his political beliefs.

Lithuania To Set Up Customs, Restrict Exports

PM1409155190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Sep 90 Second Edition p 6

[Report by Yu. Stroganov: "Customs Posts on the Highways"]

[Text] Vilnius—A Lithuanian customs service will begin operating from 1 October, following a decision by the republic's government. This is one provision of a resolution "On Additional Interim Measures To Protect the Lithuanian Republic Market." The decision was explained on republic television by Lithuanian Prime Minister K. Prunskiene. The resolution says that it has been adopted for the purpose of protecting the interests of the republic's population and achieving a better balance between commodity resources and the inhabitants' cash holdings.

Simultaneously with the organization of the customs, services of the territorial protection department are to be set up. Goods being carried across the border will be liable to confiscation if they appear on a list of prohibited exports or their value exceeds a fixed sum. Associations, enterprises, and organizations are temporarily prohibited from exporting from the republic raw materials, other supplies, products, and food and nonfood goods produced in excess of state orders or in quantities greater than provided for in long-term direct contracts concluded before 1 September 1990.

New Lithuanian Trade Law Includes Heavy Fines

LD1409164490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] For the first time in the legal practice of Lithuania, administrative fines of up to 15,000 rubles will be applied. Such a measure, and also the confiscation of property and the dismissal from the post held, is envisaged by a law adopted by the republic Supreme Soviet on responsibility for the violation of trade regulations. The aim of the new law is to strengthen the struggle against speculation, which has acquired an unprecedented scale. The law will come into force as of 17 September.

11 Soldiers Killed in Lithuanian Truck Crash

LD1309161590 Moscow TASS in English 1511 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Text] Jurbarkas, Lithuania September 13 TASS—An Army truck overturned today in the settlement of Pasaltonis of Jurbarkas district in Lithuania, killing 11 soldiers and wounding seven.

Entering a sharp curve at a high speed, the truck overturned and exploded. Local residents managed to put out the fire and extracted soldiers from under the truck. Seven soldiers were taken to hospital with burns. Two of them are in a serious condition.

The military procurator's office has begun an investigation.

Baltic Representatives on German Unification

AU1309123190 Frankfurt FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 12 Sep 90 p 2

["Admonition to the World"]

[Text] "After the unification of Germany the Baltic question has to be put on the agenda," this is the conclusion drawn by representatives of the Baltic republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, who were asked for comments on Germany's unification by the Soviet news agency NOVOSTI on Tuesday [11 September]. The following is the text of their comments:

Concerning the last round of the two-plus-four negotiations, Latvian Foreign Minister Janis Jurkans said that he would like to participate in these negotiations, but, of course, this desire is unrealistic: "All the world is busy with the unification of Germany. However, after unification, Germany should put the Baltic question on the agenda. This question, certainly, is not just an internal affair of the Soviet Union. It is an international question, which has to be decided at international forums.

"Since World War II, two problems remain unsolved in the world, namely the problem of Germany and the problem of the Baltic states. The German problem is now being resolved. It is impossible to build the all-European home as long as the three Baltic countries are occupied.

"We expect Moscow to send a message on the recognition of Latvia's independence."

Lithuanian Prime Minister Prunskiene said: The forthcoming two-plus-four talks in Moscow are of particular interest to the Lithuanian public because they will resolve questions which are linked to the results of World War II. It is well known that in the course of this war the Lithuanian Republic was deprived of its independence as a state.

"The statement of the Baltic Council, which I signed together with the other leading representatives of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, expresses our profound concern that the solution of the German problem is seen as completing the abolition of the consequences of World War II in Europe, whereas the fate of the Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian Republics is again being decided without the participation of their peoples.

"It is incomprehensible [as published] that Europe is extremely interested in a stable situation on the continent, including in the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, we want Lithuania's independence to become the topic of international discussions."

Arnold Ruutel, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Republic, told the NOVOSTI news agency: "I welcome the unification of Germany, which solves one of the postwar problems.

"I do not rule out the possibility that at negotiations on 12 September the problem of the Baltic states might be broached, in addition to the specific questions affecting Germany's unification. Each people has the right to determine its fate itself. Metaphorically speaking, peoples must never become objects of barter. We from the Baltic republics were not invited to the negotiations, even though we wanted to participate in the work for this round.

"Therefore, at a session of the Baltic Council, we called upon the victorious powers to make further efforts to abolish the consequences of World War II and to make sure that the question of the reestablishment of the full state independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia is put on the agenda. In addition, in letters to Bush, Thatcher, Kohl, Mitterrand, and Gorbachev, we expressed our willingness to actively participate in the Helsinki process as independent states. I hope that the Baltic states will be represented at the forthcoming meeting in Paris."

Baltic Trade Ministers Sign Cooperation Pact

LD1509050190 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Two days of meetings were held in Tallinn by the three Baltic republic trade ministers.

Today, a cooperation agreement, extending to 1992, that was based on the Lithuanian delegation's proposal, was signed. The ministers discussed the common trade and economic situation existing in the republics and talked about the possibility of utilizing the three republics' purchaser's cards within the Baltic market and establishing trade missions in other countries.

RSFSR

RSFSR Parliament Postpones No-Confidence Vote

PM1409155490 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Vladimir Kurasov report from the House of the RSFSR Soviets under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Decision Put Off for a Day"]

[Text] On 14 September, before the morning sitting, deputies were handed a draft resolution "On a Vote of No Confidence in the USSR Government."

The last paragraph of this brief but fairly hard-line document reads: The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet regrets that the USSR Supreme Soviet, having raised the question of confidence in N.I. Ryzhkov and his government, failed to adopt a decision on their dismissal. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet expresses a vote of no confidence in N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the USSR Government; demands that N.I. Ryzhkov and his government be dismissed; and calls on the Supreme Soviets of the USSR's republics to examine the question of a vote of no confidence in the Union government."

Some deputies demanded that this question be discussed at the current sitting. But the majority agreed with B. Yeltsin, who proposed that they should take time, discuss the draft in committees and commissions (especially since alternative versions exist), and then return to it, possibly on Saturday 15 September.

Several plenary sittings have now opened with the "Miscellaneous" section, to which 30-35 minutes are allocated. And I must say that despite the short time allocated, the questions raised have frequently been no less important and topical that those included on the main part of the agenda.

For instance, on 14 September deputies instructed their Human Rights Committee to examine the grievances of those who have pitched their tents near the "Rossiya" Hotel. The question of free enterprise zones was also raised. It was claimed that we have proclaimed these zones but have failed to formulate their political and economic status.

Then the deputies passed on to the examination of the first draft law of this session—"On Freedom of Religion." The draft has undergone substantial preliminary elaboration. As a result of an open discussion it has been approved by representatives of the the Russian Orthodox Church, Evangelical Christian Baptists, the Roman Catholic Church community, the Jewish community, the Muslims, and Buddhists, and has been amended in the light of the suggestions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions.

A report on the draft law was delivered at the session by Deputy V.S. Polosin, chairman of the Committee for Freedom of Conscience, Religions, Charity, and Charitable Works.

No-Confidence Bill Tabled 15 Sep

LD1509124190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] At today's morning session of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, discussion of details of the transition to a market economy continued. Deputies' questions were answered by one of the authors of the 500 Days program, Grigoriy Yavlinskiy. On the agenda of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet is the consideration of a draft decision showing no confidence in the USSR Government.

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session 14 Sep Detailed

Freedom of Conscience Bill Viewed

LD1409202190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1840 GMT on 14 September carries a 60-minute recorded report on the 14 September session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1841 GMT, after the registration of deputies, Yeltsin opens the session by announcing the crash of a civilian airplane near Sverdlovsk. Next, Yeltsin hands over to Father Polosin to talk on a freedom of conscience draft law.

Father Polosin begins his speech by saying that in the USSR the soul was denied for many years. In the years after the revolution most churches were closed, most priests imprisoned, most dioceses were without bishops, most monasteries were closed. Many priests were persecuted or killed. The church's activities were severely limited. He talks of the state's powers to interfere in the affairs of the church. The state registration of priests represents a gross interference. Laws still exist limiting the rights of the religious; if a priest teaches religion in school he can still be imprisoned for up to three years under existing laws. For all the above reasons the proposed law must be adopted. The USSR Supreme Soviet has been debating such a law for two years, he says, and it does not give the freedom the church needs.

At 1847 GMT Father Polosin questions why the Council of Ministers has a body for religious affairs. This organ was created by Stalin. The results of this are obvious—more churches closed. The draft law does not contradict the Constitution. Religious bodies should not need any more speical control than do composers, artists, and so forth. Believers should have the right to determine the structure of their own churches, he states.

Father Polosin says some lawyers have complained that the draft pays too much attention to questions of the property of the church and the church's privileges, but that is not so. Millions of believers expect the parliament to adopt this law and show that we are capable of making up for the mistakes of the past.

At 1853 GMT Father Polosin ends his speech. There are no questions from the auditorium. Yeltsin asks for speakers.

At 1854 GMT Deputy Yakunin, comes to the podium. He says that he has long been involved in legal affairs, defending the rights of believers. This draft is the first law that defends the rights of believers. It is of historic significance. Only one day is necessary to give believers their rights for which they will be extremely grateful.

At 1856 GMT Deputy (Bazayev) from the legislative proposals committee comes to the podium and speaks on what this draft entails. He questions whether the law is wide enough, whether it guarantees freedom of conscience for all. This law is limited only to religious beliefs. What about the beliefs of atheists and others? Should another law be drafted for them? He thinks the law should be a law on freedom of conscience and religion. The present law is just in view of the crimes the church has suffered in the past. The law allows for the teaching of religion in schools—but who will pay for this? People of differing beliefs? Bazayev's committee is in favor of adopting law with additions an amendments.

At 1903 GMT Deputy (Lyudskoy) comes to the microphone and says that the law should be adopted at its first reading, discussed article by article, and then finally adopted at its second reading. He suggests a 10-year tax-free period for the church to make up for past losses.

'History-Making' Bill Approved

LD1409144790 Moscow TASS in English 1424 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksyonov, Yuriy Kozmin and Pavel Ostrov]

[Text] Moscow September 14 TASS—The Russian Supreme Soviet approved today after the first reading the bill on the freedom of conscience. The bill was presented by Vyacheslav Poloshin, priest of the Russian Orthodox Church and chairman of the parliamentary committee on the freedom of conscience, creed, charity and mercy. He said that prominent Soviet lawyers had taken part in working out the bill, and it had been discussed with representatives of various religious confessions.

The chairman of the parliamentary committee and other speakers pointed to the significance of the bill on more than one occasion. Aleksey Surkov described the adoption of the new law as a history-making step. Gleb Yakunin, a priest and people's deputy of the Russian Federation, pointed out that the law "protects the rights both of believers and atheists". He said that the proposed bill "is in line with the world declaration of human rights".

Not a single argument against the bill was put forward during the discussion. Various opinions were expressed on the need to introduce new holidays on the territory of the Russian Federation—Christmas and Easter. However, representatives of some regions pointed out that there are supporters of various confessions in the Russian Federation, and it would be unjust to single out as non-working days the holidays of only one of them.

The bill will be finally adopted after the discussion at separate sessions of chambers of the Russian Parliament.

In the afternoon the chambers hold separate sessions.

'Differences' on Bill Bar Passage

LD1509211990 Moscow TASS in English 2109 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Report by TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov, Yuriy Kozmin, and Pavel Osetrov: "Russian Parliament Ripped by Discord, Lack of Discipline"]

[Text] Moscow September 16 TASS—The last working day of this week was marked by discord in the Russian Federation parliament: No decision was reached on a number of issues.

Differences were particulary notable during the discussion of the Bill on the Freedom of Conscience, which was not promulgated into law as tens of proposals and critical remarks submitted to commissions and committees had not been taken into account.

A heated debate was sparked off by the bill's headline which had been approved at the previous meeting.

The only point agreed to was the separation of powers between the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union. The parliament said the promulgation of a Union law was not advisable. The matter should be regulated by each republic individually.

Deputy Prime Minister Grigoriy Yavlinski told the parliament about differences in the programmes for the transition to a market system. He said Aganbegyan's programme was basically an abridged version of that proposed by the Shatalin group.

Debates flared up when discussing the powers of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. However, there was no quorum to vote on a decision and the meeting was adjourned.

Resolution on Stabilizing Economy Published

PM1409124190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

["Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Resolution 'On the Program for the Stabilization of the Economy and for the Transition to Market Relations'"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] Having discussed the fundamentals of the economic reform in accordance with the instructions of the First Congress of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To approve, in the main, the Program for the Stabilization of the Economy and for the Transition to Market Relations which was drawn up in accorance with the joint decision of M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin by S.S. Shatalin's and G.A. Yavlinskiy's working group and submitted by the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

2. To address a request to the supreme soviets of the Union republics and to the USSR Supreme Soviet that they approve and adopt the principles of the said program in the immediate future.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, jointly with the RSFSR Council of Ministers, is to prepare the necessary clarifications for the program, taking into consideration any possible observations and proposals of the Union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts and okrugs, and of RSFSR krays and oblasts, and submit these for the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's examination.

3. The RSFSR Council of Ministers, jointly with the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chambers' comissions and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's committees, is to draw up and submit in a month's time to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet a plan of practical actions for the implementation of the program, ensuring at the same time the social protection of citizens of the Russian Federation, and is to determine a system for monitoring its implementation.

The commissions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chambers and the committees of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet are to prepare and submit for the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's examination the necessary legislative acts for the implementation of the program, and proposals for amending the corresponding articles of the RSFSR Constitution to the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies.

4. Taking account of the fact that the implementation of the program requires new organizational structures of management of the USSR national economy, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium is instructed to prepare and submit the relevant proposals for the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's discussion. Proposals that are adopted are to be submitted for the USSR Supreme Soviet's examination.

5. The RSFSR Council of Ministers is to ensure the publication of the said program and its coverage in the mass media.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

RSFSR House of Soviets, Moscow, 11 September 1990.

Yavlinskiy Answers Questions on Economic Plan

PM1409160590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by I. Demchenko: "When Does the 500-Day Period Begin"]

[Text] On 10 September the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet chambers held separate sittings to discuss the program for transition to the market devised by the group led by Academician S.S. Shatalin. The parliamentarians were able to put any questions to the originators of the concept. G. Yavlinskiy, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of

Ministers and one of the program's designers, answered questions from members of the Chamber of Nationalities.

Question: Your program provides for the privatization of property. Have you allowed for the fact that money is very unevenly distributed among the population? What kind of property can be acquired by a person who has accumulated 1,500 rubles [R] or a family that has amassed R5,000 in a lifetime?

Answer: The privatization process must not be seen in primitive terms—someone coming along and buying the Kama truck plant. I think cases of someone buying up a whole enterprise, even a very small one, will be extremely rare. The privatization of a small enterprise is more likely to take place as follows: The workers will club together and make the initial payment. They can buy on a loan basis and in some cases on credit. Why should they do that? When the enterprise belongs to them, they will decide what to produce, whom to sell it to and how. And it is on their work—and nothing else—that the future prosperity of their families depends.

You must appreciate that, like you, I personally do not have a lot of money or major property holdings. Like everyone else, I was brought up to believe that private property is not exactly a grand gift. But I am offering it to you because I believe there is no alternative.

The second part of the question is the shadow economy issue. I was questioned in meticulous detail on this matter at the committee on legislation and we discussed it during work on the program with representatives of workers' movements. I am not going to go into details, but there is a mechanism to prevent shadow-economy types from buying up enterprises. Put succinctly, it means strictest control of the course of privatization by local soviets and, second, glasnost: What is for sale, at what price, who wants to buy, and his statement of income. The local press could be used for this.

Question: My voters want to know what and how much they will have 100 days from the start of the implementation of the program, what they will have after 200 days, and so on.

Answer: That is a very important question, and I want to answer it as frankly as possible. You will appreciate that we are dealing with a system of enormous complexity. It is influenced by so many factors that to give people a firm promise that after a certain period of time they would receive this or that would only be to deceive them yet again. We have fashioned a program on the mechanism of movement toward the market, not on the number of eggs per capita.

Question: Are you sure your program is realistic?

Answer: I know of no other way to switch to a market economy or, in other words, to a normal life, while avoiding a social explosion and preserving the continuity of our traditions and the link between past and future. Our concept is a tough one because we have gotten ourselves into such a state. It would be even tougher if we went on another six months.

How realistic is the program? The first period of 100 days depends on what our financial position is really like. What is our defense and security budget like? What kind of aid are we giving to other countries? What do we have in the way of gold reserves and foreign currency? If we do have reserves, the transition will be gentler. If the cupboard is bare, it will be more difficult.

As for the other problems of housing reform, land reform, the social program, privatization, restructuring of structural and investment policy, conversion—these tasks will be implemented, I am sure. Sooner or later, for better or for worse, they will because it is inevitable.

Question: What will happen if we refrain from making any changes?

Answer: If we actually draw up a budget for the republic with the present deficit—the initial estimate for the Russian budget has shown that we would have a deficit of R70 billion—and if we do nothing, there will be an almighty crisis in the spring or even earlier, with a complete breakdown of economic ties—something that is already starting to happen, bit by bit. In fact, this program, its first part at any rate, is intended to be an anticrisis program.

In conclusion, there are a few more words I want to say. We have very little time left. It is no accident that the Union government has been saying since last year that the situation is alarming and something needs to be done. The program adopted at the second congress of USSR People's Deputies failed. No program at all was adopted in May. Now we have two programs. I do not want to hurry you, but I want you all to realize that the crisis is deepening. There is hardly any thinking time left.

RSFSR's Silayev Views Shatalin Program

LD1409211790 Moscow TASS in English 2104 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Anatoliy Aladinskiy and Sergey Turanov]

[Text] Moscow September 15 TASS—"The period of moderate reforms has brought us to a crisis. Now the time is ripe for decisive action. I believe that our programme will meet with support in all republics and in the national government," Russia's Prime Minister Ivan Silayev told Soviet journalists here on Friday.

During the conversation, Silayev sought to clarify some provisions of the Shatalin programme approved by the Russian parliament this week.

He said the compilers of the programme had managed to find the only correct form of action aiming not at undermining the union but at filling it with a new economic content.

The programme's central principle is a high degree of republican independence and consensus concerning the delegation of rights to the centre.

Silayev said that the programme had been coordinated with all Union republics but Estonia.

In order to implement the programme, radical reform of the economic management system will be needed. "We favour relieving enterprises from their economic dependence on ministries this year," Silayev said.

But certain structures—like the state committee for science and technology, for instance—should be retained in order to coordinate state programmes.

Silayev said a special body should be established to control reform activity.

He noted that if republics approve the Shatalin programme, there will be no need to introduce republican own currency units. A single market implies a single currency, he said.

On measures to strengthen the rouble, Silayev said various methods existed, but he preferred those which envisage above all cuts in state expenditure, and not picking the working people's pocket.

As regards a nationwide referendum to determine ways of radical restructuring society's life, Silayev said that a mechanism for holding referendums of this kind had unfortunately not bee worked out in this country, while the government faced a very short-term credit of trust and was pressed for time.

"We believe in our cause, our programme for action which has accumulated world experience. The main thing now is for people to trust us and thing along the same lines. The plans for transforming society can only be realised if we act together," Silayev said.

Silayev Holds Press Conference 15 Sep

LD1609143390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1240 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Press conference by I.S. Silayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, moderated by press secretary V.M. Sergeyev; date and place not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Sergeyev] Allow me to open this working meeting. Allow me to open and begin the conversation between the prime minister and the press and between the press and the Russian prime minister. As far as I understand it, Ivan Stepanovich would like not only to talk himself, but also to consult you as people who are very familiar with public opinion and who read letters every day. And publications are represented here which are literally flooded with letters. Therefore, I think that an exchange of opinions will be very useful. The theme of the conversation is the program of the Russian government, the program of the fate of Russia, if one can say that.

[Silayev] Yesterday I was in Arkhangelsk oblast, in Arkhangelsk itself. There I met with collectives of the workers and with the intelligentsia. I ended yesterday's meeting with a very active exchange of opinions. This allows me in some way to examine the course being conducted today by our Russian government, to feel whether we are going in the right direction, and whether there is support for our intentions and views and approaches. To a certain extent I am probably... [changes thought] My reaction to how our Russian people regard us, what they expect from us, what they demand from us. To a certain extent this inspires me with hope that we are not fighting in vain for the Shatalin and Yavlinskiy program and I am prepared today to express my positions to you, defending the principles on which we do not yet have agreement. Although, it is possible today that—in the USSR Supreme Soviet there are several plans, as far as I know—it is possible that there is some movement.

But, first of all, I would like to express my thoughts about the economic union. We are reproached by people who say that we Russians, the leadership of the republic, are moving toward breaking up our union. We do not agree with this. I do not agree with this because cracks started to appear in it before fate brought us—me personally and our government—here.

And the principles—this is section number three. I understand that you have this to hand, the first part and the second part? [brief indistinct discussion about whether the participants have the document]

There is a special section here, section number three. Take a look at it. It concerns questions of economic relations between the Union republics. It seems to us and, moreover, we see and we are sure of this, that the authors of this program have found the only correct line of uniting the republics without waiting for the conclusion of the new Union treaty, because very complicated processes are under way and it is still difficult to say when and how they will be ended. But economic mutual understanding, understanding of and mutual interest in each other—that is between the republics—is very clear and realized and it has been reflected in this third section which, I make so bold as to assure you, has been agreed to by all the Union republics except Estonia. At 1400 today we are to meet the Latvian government. A draft has been drawn up for our economic relations with that republic. And we have almost completed preparing economic treaties—although only for 1991 as yet—with all the other Union republics.

We are proposing before the end of the month to manage to sign agreements with many of them. It is simply that we may not physically have sufficient time. A certain proportion will be signed at the start of October. A new process is thus beginning—a process, to a great extent, of the independence of the republics which have proclaimed their sovereignty and their independence, especially in the economic sphere, and which are indeed signing these economic treaties with each other. In effect, this is already being implemented.

[Unidentified correspondent] One of the main opponents of the Shatalin group's program is Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin who has been using the term sovereignty of the Union. How then is the sovereignty of the republics to be reconciled with the notion of the sovereignty of the Union? I must say that I personally do not fully understand the term, but perhaps in the course of the consultations it has emerged what he has in mind.

[Silayev] Well, you are only assuming this. If he has in mind protecting the center from the Union republics, there is in my view no need for this. We are not intending to display any aggression. We are only talking of executive matters and, accordingly, about the functions of central bodies. If it is a question of the external sovereignty of our Union as a whole, Russian deputies have repeatedly expressed their desire. They have said that we are in favor of the Union and we are in favor of unity. Therefore it seems to me that it cannot be supposed that Comrade Abalkin's utterances and apprehensions should apply to either of these aspects, but with respect to any third aspect it is difficult for me to make assumptions.

[Unidentified correspondent] My first question is about the agro-industrial complex. How is it that agrarian specialists have in effect not taken part in elaborating the concept for transition to the market?

[Silayev] We reached agreement both in the Supreme Soviet and in the government—and Yavlinskiy, I recall, agrees too—that we shall definitely tie in this sphere. The only thing that we shall not be tying in—and I speak frankly—are the interests of those who favor only the collective farm system, the collective and state farm system, the collective system, and those who are completely against accepting privatization, including the introduction of the practice of private property. We are aware that a considerable proportion of agricultural specialists in Russia, including in our Supreme Soviet, have varying viewpoints on this. In this respect I had been ready to reply further to questions about this, but this is what we feel. I shall even tell you that esteemed Vasily Aleksandrovich Starodubtsev—I have repeatedly expressed my profound respect for him as a person who has tirelessly striven for the peasantry to enjoy equal rights in our society and, moreover, for them to be constantly kept in view and supported by all sections of society—he, however, is absolutely against acceptance.

[Unidentified correspondent] Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin] gave a television interview yesterday in which he said that if the Russian program is not adopted by the Union parliament for implementation in 500 days, we will, however regrettably, have to introduce our own Russian currency.

[Silayev] Since you mentiion it, I must say that, working on this program, the principal republics which had planned to introduce a currency as part of their measures said that in that case we will not have to bring in our own currency, we will refrain from doing so for a few years at least. That also helps us in trying to promote the strengthening of our Union. And such an agreement practically exists in principle. Given a single market, there is a single currency, and at least the intentions of individual republics of thinking about having their own currency are being deferred.

[Unidentified correspondent] A decision has been made to set up several free economic zones. Among these zones is our Zelenograd. I am interested in the following: There is as yet no operating mechanism for these zones. How is the mechanism going to be worked out? And second, is the existence and operation of such zones justified in small areas such as the Moscow zone in this instance, on small areas?

[Silayev] It seems to me, and it seems to the government, that these six economic zones which were proclaimed in July represent an opportunity for a sort of test-site, an experiment, whereby in a limited area and on the scale of a small part of our Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] economic region we can try out the main principles of market relations there. We have already drawn up plans for several of the zones. At least four zones have submitted their proposed blueprints. We are now looking at them and preparing a relevant decision, in line with instructions from the Supreme Soviet. We would like to test out all the main principles here. And if there are any underwater reefs which have not been considered, and that is quite possible, we shall be able to make adjustments and level things out as we go along. If there are mistakes, they can be rectified on the level of a specific oblast or [word indistinct]. That will not be difficult and will be without greater consequences.

[Unidentified correspondent] At his press conference, Comrade Yeltsin said that the government program and the Shatalin program are incompatible in principle. If the Union Supreme Soviet fails to adopt the Shatalin program, Russia will still pursue the latter and not the Union program. Now, to judge by the latest events in the Supreme Soviet, a combined program will be adopted in the end. It is another matter that the government program will represent just one or two percent perhaps. In other words, it wil simply be a courtesy. Nevertheless, a combined program is being adopted. What actions will Russia take? After all, announcements have been made.

[Silayev, interjecting] I understand.

[Correspondent continues] And second I would like to ask you to make a political forecast as far as your position permits you. What will happen to the Ryzhkov-led Union government after the adoption of the program with which he disagrees. And here is my third question: Could you tell us please if you can what happened to the diamond deal, and to the sale of gold to the well-known company De Beers?

Boris Nikolayevicvh said that he and Mikhail Sergeyvich had resolved this question. It has been appraised as a quirky political incident, he said, and that it will never happen again. Could you lift the lid a little and tell us what stands behind it?

[Silayev] We have achieved the main result here—and in this respect the president gave us his support. If you remember, in the second part he reproached us and even somehow offended us with the republics a little.

But the second part gives instructions specifically on this deal, and generally that in the future republics themselves must participate without fail in the elaboration and conclusion of any deal affecting the interests of the republic's territory. Therefore, we intend to (?take part) in this deal, as it cannot be canceled now. Unfortunately, indeed, some carelessness has been shown there and this aspect in our decision began to worry Western partners who started to wonder whether we are the right people to have deals with if some of us conclude contracts whereas others cancel them. [word indistinct] Therefore, as you may remember, a press conference was held which was followed by the statement of Khozbulatov and other statements. We gave official confirmation that we are not canceling any deals that have already been concluded.

Therefore, the main thing now is that under this decree, the president's decree, the Union government has no right from now on to conclude without us any major deals without taking into account our interests there. We believe that this as well as our participation in the diamond deal has received the president's support. But naturally, we will still keep an eye on how things develop in the future.

Now over to the question as to what will happen if the RSFSR's program is not adopted. That is difficult for me to imagine. In fact, I cannot imagine that it will not be adopted if the Union republics give us their support—after all, they were the ones who elaborated this program. And so, if many, many Union republics give us their support, what program will the Union government be adopting? I simply find it difficult to imagine.

After all, the government program says that the main events will be taking place in the republics. The main economic responsibility for the state of affairs is being put on the republics. The government program outlines this quite clearly—you can take a look and see it for yourselves. And we believe that this is how it should be: Each republic, including the RSFSR, must have the rights and must therefore be accountable before its own people, the people of that republic. But if all of this is taking place in the republics, then the sum total of these interests forms the interests of the Union. Therefore, I cannot imagine that things can be otherwise. Then in whose interests will be that program [of the Union], the alternative program, the fundamental issues of which will diverge from the programs which will be, I believe, supported by the Union republics? I think that what will triumph here is that major fundamental issues, which the republics have put at the basis of this program, will nevertheless, I believe, enjoy support. I am still an optimist here.

Finally, the second question which I was asked. If you pay attention, this program even contains a diagram of structural changes in the system of the management of the national economy. If you have not see it, perhaps you will take a look when we finish it. Then you will see there that the principles laid at the foundation of the Shatalin and Yavlinskiy program inevitably lead to different structural formations in the regulation and administration of the economy and other spheres of life. In a word, different structures of the government—different functions and different structures. Well, I am sure you know that we are in favor of making enterprises economically independent of the sectors this year.

So we are in favor of enterprises being economically free. Not only state enterprises—the cooperatives are now almost in the market, though certain deformations are at work here too, (?but mainly) the enterprises. But if the industry remains, what kind of freedom can there be? What functions will that industry perform? Some say scientific and technical progress, but if we look at how (?bad) it is today in, let us say, the United States and West Germany, they have different structures—they do have such a structure, they have a committee or something of the kind that handles or coordinates development. We have a committee, a committee for science and technology, and we are not saying it should be scrapped. It must remain and then technical progress will be accomplished in labor collectives, institutes, enterprises, and so on. So this principle alone indicates that there is no place in this program for industry ministries.

[Unidentified correspondent] Reform of management is clearly a top issue. Will there be some specific management body, because as I see it the reform begun three years ago fell victim to the five-year plan and various operational problems, and not only the dogmas (?contained) in that plan. And if such a body is set up what will the division of jurisidiction and powers be between it and, let us say, the government, or will it be a part of the government?

[Silayev] We expect that questions will arise from the very outset. They are inevitable. Consequently, there must be a group—not a group by a center, for managing the implementation and monitoring of these steps and everything that arises demanding legislative changes, which we do not rule out either, or else specific directives by the appropriate bodies and governments—all of this will have to be adjusted on the move without wasting time on numerous consultations. This group, as I envision it, will manage the implementation mechanism, apart from the organizational work by the government or the center and other correspondent structures, including perhaps the Internal Affairs Ministry or the Procuracy. If you have signed a contract and you do not honor it you have to suffer the appropriate sanctions as they do abroad. There, for instance, it is $10,000 and a year in prison. This is the way they do things, although as a rule nobody is sent to prison but the fines are imposed. So there definitely has to be a mechanism.

[Unidentified correspondent] Women make up a (?large part) of our workforce but they are also in semi-slavery, both in the (?population) and in economic employment. We can judge from the mail that our journal receives—with a circulation of 24 million the mailbag is huge—what people think of the proposed changes. And the letters are simply very, very disturbing. People... women are insanely afraid of the switch to market; they are afraid of privatization, afraid of market relations, afraid of becoming unemployed and that they will be thrown out right away, especially single women, women with large families, and so on.

[Silayev] One of the most important tasks of our government, the authors of this program and in fact of all, of our government—and it is necessary to tell the people—is to answer the elementary questions that concern them. And we intend to do this. It may seem a small and imperceptible transformation, but maybe one of you has noticed it. Because originally, before the work of this group, social protection was talked about. In this program you will see the term social guarantees. There have appeared in the government program—and I received it this morning—the switch to the market and the conceptions and the program; that is the government program of forming the structure and mechanism of regulating the market economy and the term guarantee also arose here. Well, we know what our weakest part is: It is students, invalids, pensioners, the many large families receiving low wages—but we are talking about social guarantees for any member of our society, and they also should have some guarantees. But in this case a guarantee is strengthened by personal conditions and efforts; if one is capable and will work well, following these principles of market relations, then one is guaranteed both good earnings and a good existence. That is, here we have a more profound and I would say very philosophical sense. That is it how it seems to me—and this is the topic of discussion. And so, on the background of these social guarantees, the protection of this group of the poorly protected, of the low paid, here it has not found convincing respect, and now this work is going on.

[Unidentified correspondent] There has been a lot of criticism of the word collocation: regulated market. But it is not just a matter of words—the main thing is the meaning invested in these words. After a cursory look through the documents we were given today I have not found those words. Is this chance or is there some purpose behind it?

[Silayev] If we think back to how it all started, it started with the planned regulated market. Here I would like to say that this did not conform, for example, with my proposal which might not sound too good here. Even in my former post, under pressure from fierce criticism about the government being bad and incapable and being (?capable of nothing), after profound analysis and thought—because it seemed we were trying and adopting measures, though things were getting worse and worse—reached conclusions and a corresponding package of proposals was submitted. In particular, I, together with my former colleagues, proposed opening up our market to Western companies without delay. If there was a shortage of tractors or mini tractors or something else, let the Western companies bring them to us. They are even willing to import them for rubles, subsequently investing those rubles in real estate and so on. But if we are to have a socialist market does this mean the capitalists have to right of access? So this was quickly superceded.

Then the academics rebelled against this, let us say, contradictory term planned regulated market. Eventually everyone reached the conclusion that regulation-...first, that the market itself regulates a lot, including (?planned markets). And they do exist, in the West too. So it is not at all a matter of chance that the word is missing from the program. The market is a market. It contains elements of regulation and, in effect, the market itself regulates economic relations. This, to me, is the main functional purpose of the market: the market itself. But there are also elements of regulation by any state. This is natural, so we use the classical term to describe it. The market is the market.

[Unidentified correspondent] On the subject of the brain drain. It has been reported that 1.5 million applications have been handed in to the U.S. Embassy and some forecasts estimate that once the law on emigration is in force, around 13 million will leave, and these are not only highly-qualified people but people with enterprising flair, given that they have decided to do that with their lives. It is a big loss. So I would like to hear your view as to why these people do not believe that they can find a place for themselves in the market economy and that they will be in demand and also paid here appropriately?

[Silayev] Well, it is a national tragedy—if I can put it that way—for the Soviet Union, that at the very start of our socialist existence we eliminated the great Russian...I keep referring to our Russian society, who were in the fire of the revolution and whole dynasties disappeared. Here we are faced with work that is, of course, more painstaking and serious, and I can tell you that I began my working day today by going to the Malyy Theater, to the construction site there, both as a favor to Solomin and, if only by such a gesture and concrete action, to begin the process of revival of our spirituality, our culture, physical and spiritual, to direct attention to these spheres, and we are going to work on giving worthy opportunities and a place to our creative intelligentsia to work here in our republic.

RSFSR Supsov Issues Resolution on 1990 Harvest

PM1409135190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

["Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Resolution 'On Additional Measures To Complete the 1990 Harvest and To Stabilize the Food Market in the RSFSR'"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] Noting the tense situation that has taken shape once again in the gathering of the harvest, and also the instances that have become apparent of a destabilization of the food market, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To call upon the supreme soviets of autonomous republics and the local soviets of people's deputies to make fuller use of the right of local self-management and of the new economic conditions which are afforded by RSFSR Council of Ministers Resolution No. 259 of 26 July 1990 and by RSFSR Council of Ministers Resolution No. 303 of 15 August 1990, in order to complete the gathering of the 1990 harvest within a short time; to create stocks of feed and of food from local resources; to ensure the complete fulfillment of contracts for the delivery of meat, milk, flour, potatoes, vegetables, and other products, so as to preserve to the maximum degree possible the economic links that have become established between enterprises and organizations and so as to ensure reciprocal deliveries of food and agricultural raw materials for 1991.

2. The RSFSR Council of Ministers is to take the necessary additional steps to ensure the gathering and safekeeping of the harvest including: the creation of conditions for the intensification of the material vested interest of workers and enterprises engaged on the gathering of the harvest; the granting of permission to the leaders of farms in individual instances to make payment for harvesting work both in money and in kind, on the basis of local conditions, for the purpose of preserving the products that have been grown; the enhancement of the vested interest and the intensification of the responsibility of industrial enterprises, associations, and organizations for providing the agro-industrial complex with all types of material and technical resources that are essential to them.

3. The RSFSR Council of Ministers is to take the necessary organizational and economic steps to stabilize the market in basic agricultural goods, including the establishment of additional payments to workers of the relevant sectors for work on evening and nighttime shifts, on Sundays, and on holidays from money deducted into the budget from profits and from the turnover tax by enterprises and organizations of these sectors.

4. The RSFSR Council of Ministers, jointly with local organs, is to prepare proposals for the creation of republican stocks for the guaranteed supply of the most important types of food goods to the population.

5. The RSFSR Council of Ministers is to conduct negotiations and conclude interrepublican agreements on the terms and procedure for centralized and decentralized purchases of food products and raw materials in other republics. Negotiations are to be conducted on the import of food and raw materials for the food industry within the limits of the sum of hard currency resources enivisioned by the plan for 1990.

6. The RSFSR Council of Ministers is to be more exacting concerning officials responsible for providing the trade sphere with basic food goods. G.V. Kulik, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and RSFSR minister of agriculture and food, is to be warned about his personal responsibility for averting crisis situations with regard to providing the republic's population with basic food goods, and also for ensuring a normal rhythm of work in future harvest campaigns.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

RSFSR House of Soviets, Moscow, 11 September 1990.

RSFSR Fulfills 59 Percent of State Grain Order

LD1209105790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 12 Sep 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] According to the latest information from the USSR Central Statistical Directorate, 28.2 million tonnes of grain was procured in the Russian Federation by 10 September. This means that only 59 percent of the state order has been fulfilled, although the grain harvest in Russia is ending. Only Siberia and the Urals are mowing at present. [passage omitted]

RSFSR Minister Interviewed on Grain Sales

LD1109132190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1100 GMT on 11 September carries a four-minute live or recorded interview with Leonid Stepanovich Chishinskiy, RSFSR minister of grain products, by an unidentified correspondent. Place and date of the interview are not given.

Commenting on problems of grain sales to the state, Chishinskiy begins by saying: "To date, we have already received 28 million tonnes. You know that we have to procure 47 million tonnes but there is an extremely tense situation with procurements in the current year, something that is, unfortunately, being made worse by the weather factor." The situation is extremely bad in Orenburg Oblast, the Volga Valley, Ulyanovsk and Kuybyshev oblasts, Chishinskiy says. The drying of grain is proceeding well, however. Significantly more grain for foodstuffs has been received this year: an approximate total of 17 million tonnes of grain for flour. "This will, naturally, allow us to ease the tension that has developed to date." There is also a shortfall in fodder crops.

Asked about measures to stimulate the sale of grain to the state, the minister confirms that his ministry is awaiting an imminent decision on this by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Decree Extends Farmers' Right To Sell Produce

PM1209104590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[Text of RSFSR Council of Ministers Resolution "On Expanding the Rights of Producers of Perishable Agricultural Produce To Sell it for Ready Cash and To Use the Money Obtained"]

[Text] With a view to strengthening the consumer market, reducing losses of agricultural produce, and expanding the independence of those who produce it, the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] decrees:

1. That kolkhozes [collective farms], sovkhozes [state farms] and other agricultural enterprises be allowed to sell surplus perishable agricultural produce (fruit, berries, vegetables, grapes, potatoes) left after fulfilling their contracts and also up to 30 percent of this output which is part of the state order for ready cash directly to the population and also both by written order and for ready cash to cooperatives and other consumers.

2. That the profit from the sale of this produce is reflected separately in a special account opened by producers in the itemized cost record [analiticheskiy uchet], is used by them as they see fit without any restrictions whatsoever on obtaining ready cash in bank institutions and is freed of any quota restrictions, including taxation on the growth of the labor wages fund.

3. That it be recommended to agricultural enterprises that they conclude contracts with retail trade enterprises for the sale of the agricultural produce indicated in point one of this resolution at contract prices, the profit obtained being reflected in a special account opened by the economic organ in the itemized cost record.

4. Stores, wholesale enterprises, and procurement organizations buying and selling the agricultural produce indicated in point one of this resolution and also transport enterprises and other links in the agro-industrial complex can also open individual special accounts for the profit from the sale of this produce using the profit within the procedure stipulated by point three of this resolution.

[Signed] I. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, A. Sterligov, RSFSR Council of Ministers administrator of affairs,

Moscow, 15 August 1990.

Oleynik Describes Multi-Party System

LD1009152790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1316 GMT 10 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 10 Sep (TASS)—TASS Parliamentary Correspondents Lev Aksenov, Boris Zverev, and Andrey Orlov report from the Kremlin:

"We are starting to function under the conditions of a multi-party system," this, briefly, is how Boris Oleynik, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities described his meeting with representatives of a number of all-Union and Russian parties and movements. The meeting, devoted to the preparation for and the concept of a new Union treaty, took place in the deputies' club of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the initiative of the Soviet of Nationalities on Saturday, 8 September. A news conference devoted to this event took place in the press center of the Soviet parliament today.

Journalists were informed that representatives of the Constitutional-Democratic Party (the people's liberal party) took part in the meeting as well as of the Party of Constitutional Democrats, the Liberal-Democratic Party, the Socialist Party, the Russian Christian-Democratic Movement, the Christian-Democratic Movement of Russia, the Information-Popular Party of the Russian Federation [Informatsionno-Naradnaya Partiya Rossiyskoy Federatsii], the "civil action" committees, the confederation of anarcho-syndicalists, the union of democratic forces, the society "Unity of Leninism and Communist Ideals," the Marxist platform for the CPSU and the Confederation of Labor. Boris Oleynikov stressed this was just the first meeting, others will follow after it and all parties and movements, without exception, that express the wish to take part in them "will be met with appropriate respect and attention."

The problem of the future federal or confederal structure of the country became a key one during the course of the discussion, Boris Oleynik noted. The opinions of those present were divided, but at the same time despite the polarity of the positions and fundamental differences they came to an agreement on the fact that the achievement of internal political stability was necessary. Those taking part in the meeting came out in favor of the consolidation of all of society's political forces with the aim of extracting the country from crisis.

RSFSR CP Editorial Commission Members Listed

90UN2785A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Sep 90 Single Edition p 3

[Roster of members of the Editorial Commission of the Constituent Congress of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party]

[Text] Chairman: Prokofyev, Yu.A.

Commission Members: Anipkin, A.M.; Antonov, V.G.; Babichev, O.I.; Bardyshev, V.F.; Betin, O.I.; Bindyukov, N.G.; Bulatnikov, Yu.A.; Bunich, P.G.; Bystrov, N.V.; Vechkanov, V.T.; Vladimirov, B.G.; Gakova, L.F.; Glushakov, A.V.; Gomich, S.A.; Goryushkin, S.I.; Dvorskiy, M.N.; Dorovin, Ye.V.; Yevstifeyev, V.V.; Zabrodin, Yu.M.; Zakharov, V.A.; Zlodeyev, V.P.; Kalita, Yu.P.; Kotov, A.V.; Krivosheyev, L.Ya.; Lukyanin, V.P.; Malkov, N.I.; Maltsev, A.N.; Mindolin, V.A.; Motygina, I.N.; Novikov, V.A.; Osadchiy, I.P.; Fershin, G.A.; Petrenko, A.S.; Pozhidayev, V.A.; Polozkov, I.K.; Popov, V.D.; Rebrov, G.K.; Rozhnov, A.G.; Rudenskiy, A.S.; Ryabov, V.V.; Salamashkin, V.A.; Sein, V.I.; Seleznev, A.I.; Simonov, A.A.; Sklyar, G.I.; Sleptsov, K.D.; Smirnov, G.A.; Sokolov, A.S.; Stolyarov, N.S.; Suslin, V.T.; Travov, V.P.; Tyulkin, V.A.; Fedotov, A.Ye.; Cherezov, O.A.; Chertishchev, V.S.; Cheshegovora, M.V.; Chikin, V.V.; Shirshin, G.Ch.

Leningrad Mayor Tenders Resignation

LD1509151390 Moscow TASS in English 1344 GMT 15 sep 90

[By TASS correspondents John Polishchuk and Oleg Serdobolskiy]

[Text] Leningrad September 15 TASS—Chairman of the Leningrad Executive Council Aleksandr Shchelkanov, who won the race for the post against forty other contestants, has tendered his resignation, three months after his land-slide victory.

The move came a surprise to many Leningraders. It is being regarded as a political sensation, causing alarm and apprehension. The personal and public career of the fifty-year old mayor has reflected the complexity and dramatic peripeties of perestroyka and demoncratisation.

Once a shipbuilding engineer and a military interpreter, he went to work as a stevedore to remain true to his principle in the struggle against appratchiks. This extravagant move however, did not cut short his political career.

His integrity and honesty won the hearts of Leningraders who elected him a USSR people's deputy.

Having shouldered the huge burden of responsibility for the fate of the city in a critical situation, Shchelkanov began by shaping new executive structures.

As the newly-elected deputy corps failed to supply the needed backing he counted upon, Shchelkanov repeatedly voiced disapproval of the Leningrad City Council's low efficiency.

He charged deputies with wasting precious time in useless debates unable to yield a consensus and said it was a testimony to the fact that the Leningrad Council, democratically elected for the first time in years, was desperately in need of greater professionalism.

The forthcoming session of the Leningrad Council will have to decide whether to accept Shchelkanov's resignation.

Sobchak Comments on Resignation

LD1609211590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 16 Sep 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Yesterday's broadcast of the Vremya included a TASS report that Aleksandr Shchelkanov, chairman of the Leningrad Soviet, people's deputy of the USSR, had resigned. This is the report in my hand. Well, we have received many conflicting reports, in general. Some hours ago we contacted our Leningrad correspondent to clarify the truth. This is what he told us.

[Begin Sergey Dukhavin recording] Indeed, this information—first on Leningrad Television and then in the local press—came as a bolt from the not-very blue. The point is that it has been raining during recent days. For example, here is a headline from a paragraph in LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA—Shchelkanov has resigned. VECHERNIY LENINGRAD reports more cautiously that he has asked to resign. Unfortunately, we have not managed to talk to Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Shchelkanov. However, we have been able to have a talk with Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchak, chairman of the Leningrad Soviet, before he flew to Moscow. This is what the chairman of the Leningrad Soviet said:

[Sobchak] There have been no official decisions or statements, as it were; and as for workers' conferences and workers' conversations, a very great deal is discussed in them and a great deal is said. If the matter goes as far as an official statement, we shall then pass on the text of that statement ourselves to the "Vremya" program and to everyone. This talk is advantageous to the forces of yesterday, who would very much like it if the new democratic authorities did not succeed in taking power into their hands, if they had already failed and themselves renounced the implementation of power.

New Leningrad Soviet Paper Seeks Editor

90UN2798A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Sep 90 p 4

[Competition regulations: "New Editor for NEVSKOYE VREMYA"]

[Text] Yesterday the Leningrad City Soviet Glasnost and Mass Media Commission approved regulations governing the procedure and timeframe of a competition for the position of chief editor of NEVSKOYE VREMYA, the weekly social and political newspaper of the Leningrad City Soviet. The deputies set 17 September 1990 as the deadline for presentation of competition papers. It was decided to conduct candidate hearings at a meeting of the commission on 19 September. For future applicants we publish:

REGULATIONS governing the competition for the position of chief editor of NEVSKOYE VREMYA, weekly social and political newspaper of the Leningrad City Soviet

1. The chief editor of NEVSKOYE VREMYA, the newspaper of the Leningrad City Soviet, will be approved in the Presidium of the Leningrad City Soviet of People's Deputies on a competitive basis.

2. Persons residing in the city of Leningrad with work experience in the mass media and with higher education have the right to take part in the competition for the position of chief editor of the newspaper NEVSKOYE VREMYA.

Applicants will submit to the Standing Commission of the Leningrad City Soviet for Glasnost and Mass Media their application, higher education diploma, resume, personal artistic and journalistic pieces, and programs of their future activity on not more than five typewritten pages and other documents (at their discretion).

4. The Leningrad City Soviet Glasnost and Mass Media Commission will at its meeting consider the documents presented by the applicants and, if they meet the conditions of Sections 2 and 3, will notify the applicants of the time and date of the hearings.

5. Procedure of hearings of candidates for the position of chief editor of the newspaper NEVSKOYE VREMYA.

5.1. The hearings will be held at a meeting of the Leningrad City Soviet Glasnost and Mass Media Commission.

5.2. The candidates for the position of chief editor of the newspaper NEVSKOYE VREMYA will be introduced by the chairman of the Glasnost and Mass Media Commission.

5.3. The candidates for the position of chief editor of the newspaper NEVSKOYE VREMYA will, at the meeting of the Leningrad City Soviet Glasnost and Mass Media Commission, present a program of future activity and proposals pertaining to the structure of the editorial office and a concept of the activity of the newspaper NEVSKOYE VREMYA.

5.4. The duration of the candidates' speeches and the procedure and duration of the discussion will be determined at the meeting of the Leningrad City Soviet Glasnost and Mass Media Commission.

5.5. Upon completion of the hearings the Leningrad City Soviet Glasnost and Mass Media Commission will confirm a list of candidates for the position of chief editor of the newspaper NEVSKOYE VREMYA for approval in the Presidium of the Leningrad City Soviet of People's Deputies.

6. Procedure for approval of the chief editor of the newspaper NEVSKOYE VREMYA:

6.1. The chairman of the Standing Commission for Glasnost and Mass Media of the Leningrad City Soviet will at the Leningrad City Soviet Presidium meeting give notice of the hearings which have been held and present the list of candidates for discussion.

6.2. The need for and duration of the speeches of the applicants for the position of chief editor of the newspaper NEVSKOYE VREMYA and also the need for and duration of discussion will be determined by the Leningrad City Soviet Presidium.

6.3. Upon completion of the discussion of the candidacies a vote will be taken.

6.4. The candidate who has obtained more than half the vote of all members of the Leningrad City Soviet Presidium will be considered approved for the position of chief editor of the newspaper NEVSKOYE VREMYA.

6.5. In the event that no candidate obtains more than half the vote, there will be a second round of voting, in which the two candidates who have obtained the most votes will take part. If in the second round no candidate obtains the number of votes required for approval, the decision on the procedure of further confirmation will be made by the Leningrad City Soviet Presidium.

LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA Describes New Editor

90UN2798B Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Sep 90 p 1

[Report on interview with O.S. Kuzin, new chief editor of LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA; place and date not given: "LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA: New Chief Editor"; first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] Today's issue is signed off for the first time by LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA's new chief editor Oleg Sergeyevich Kuzin. He is 37 years old. A native Leningrader. A graduate of Leningrad State University and the Leningrad Higher Party School; over 15 years of Communist Youth League and party experience; was secretary of the Kuybyshevskiy Rayon Party Committee. This year he became deputy chairman of the oblast party committee ideology, culture and mass- political work commission and head of a department of the commission. He is married, with a 13-year-old daughter.

Oleg Kuzin is a member of the Journalists Union. He has appeared frequently in the press of late. The book "The Informals: Who's Who?", which he co-authored, was put out this year by the "Mysl" publishers.

[Correspondent] Oleg Sergeyevich, although you have appeared in the press frequently you are not, for all that, a professional journalist. But you are head of what is, as of today, Leningrad's biggest newspaper. Does this not embarrass you?

[Kuzin] Of course, the fact that I have not previously worked on a newspaper makes my position more difficult. But I am counting a great deal on the support of the editorial office and on the journalists helping me to quickly become familiar with newspaper work.

At the same time, however, I think it possible for a newspaper to be headed by a person who is not a professional journalist. The chief editor of any paper is first and foremost a politician, whichever party's and organization's interests he represents.

[Correspondent] What are your political predilections?

[Kuzin] I will express my positions in my articles. I consider it necessary for an editor to write in the newspaper constantly.

[Correspondent] How do you conceive of LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA-91?

[Kuzin] LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA should be a popular newspaper raising all topics of interest to the reader. At the same time it must describe the activity of Leningrad's Communists and the primary party organizations. And will be no less interesting to people for this, I believe. Leningrad's Communists are a real political force. And their opinion needs to be considered and known.

City Party Abandons Approved Cadre Listing

PM1009145390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by correspondent Aleksandr Dergachev: "Goodbye Nomenklatura"]

[Text] The Maykop Gorkom [City Party Committee] bureau has abolished its nomenklatura, which comprised 526 economic and party workers.

Explaining why the party gorkom bureau decided to do this, Gorkom First Secretary L. Simatov said that, now that Article 6 of the USSR Constitution has been revoked, it would be naive to preserve the party's cadre diktat. Moreover, the practice of appointing cadres to the bureau is largely obsolete and has become a formality.

At the same time, L. Simatov said, the gorkom is not dissociating itself from the formation of the city's cadre potential. The next session of the city soviet will devise a mechanism for forming the city's "cadre nucleus." Both the gorkom and the primary party organizations will, of course, participate actively in the nomination of leaders by people's deputies. They will be seeking to nominate their own candidates for particular posts by political methods.

Moscow Soviet Fined Over Tobacco Price Hike

PM1109152790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Sep 90 p 1

[T. Borisov report: "Who Will Smoke Out Whom? The State Committee on Prices Versus Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee"]

[Text] The POSTFAKTUM agency has announced that, under a USSR State Committee on Prices' decision of 6 September, the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee was fined 1.5 million rubles [R] for organizing the sale of tobacco products at commercial prices.

The very fact of this fine offers food for thought. We ask A. Komin, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee on Prices, to comment on it. "When it became apparent that the Moscow City Soviet did not intend to follow the resolution, the State Committee on Prices did indeed adopt the decision to fine the Moscow City Soviet R1.5 million for illegally organizing the sale of a quantity of Soviet cigarettes at commercial prices and, in addition, to oblige it to pay R1.5 million of the difference in the prices.

"Moscow City Soviet Chairman G. Popov for his part accused us of being prejudiced against Moscow and indulgent toward other regions. This in no way corresponds to the truth, because we adopted exactly the same decisions when cigarette prices were increased in Estonia, when Sobchak put vodka prices up in Leningrad, and when brandy prices were increased in Moldavia. Only on those occasions our decisions were not carried out; and, to be honest, we do not expect Moscow City Soviet to remove the commercial prices and pay the fine in the present case either."

And in the opinion of the smokers on the editorial staff (although I do not share it)—better "Kosmos" for R3 than not at all.

Moscow Discusses Proposal for Labor Exchange

LD1209143190 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 12 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Bersenev]

[Text] Moscow September 12 TASS—A labour exchange is set to appear in Moscow several decades after all exchanges were closed in the Soviet Union. The Presidium of the Moscow City Executive Committee are now discussing the proposal, but are expected to give it their seal of approval soon.

The Soviet media is psychologically preparing citizens for the inevitability of unemployment in a market economy and for the closure of unprofitable enterprises.

The exchange will implement the state's employment and workers upgrading policy, help the population to benefit from state guaranteed employment legislation, ensure its social protection from unemployment, keep its hand on the pulse of the Moscow labour market, record the unemployed, and evaluate the employment ratio.

Apart from controlling employment in the capital, the exchange will contract people to work in other parts of the Soviet Union and in foreign countries. A social protection fund is expected to be set up at the exchange, as well as a commercial bank to help the unemployed set up small and family enterprises and cooperatives.

A working group has been set up to draft provisional rules for the Moscow labour exchange and to submit for approval the final versions of its structure and personnel.

Moscow Soviet To Consider City Management Plans

PM1409135790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by TASS correspondent Yu. Bersenev: "Moscow Scheme Needed"]

[Text] The problem of city management is gaining prominence. This was stressed at a meeting between G. Popov, chairman of Moscow Soviet, and the capital's deputy corps. In the opinion of the Soviet chairman, the awkward, cumbersome nature of the present city management system largely explains many of the difficulties and social conflicts being experienced by the capital.

The Moscow mayor presented deputies with several different management reorganization schemes for their assessment.

The first scheme was presented by the rayons themselves. They demand "independence." In this case, power seems to be brought closer to the population and there are greater opportunities to resolve "painful issues" by consulting directly with those affected, which is the scheme's strong point. However, it completely fails to mention the unequal levels of development in the rayons. After all, there are "poor" and "rich" rayons. We could end up with a situation where some rayons do not have the resources to resolve their own problems. There is another objection: Would this not cause bad feeling between them? Even now, there is one rayon with a better vegetable supply that insists these vegetables be sold exclusively to people registered as rayon residents.

The second scheme is the exact opposite. It could be called the "Madrid model." It advocates a three-tier management system: an elected city municipality plus elected municipalities in residential districts and at middle level; that is, the okrugs, which would be the executive bodies of the city municipality. This system envisages an efficient solution to problems connected with the sewerage system, water and heating supplies, the provision of telephone facilities, and so forth. However, the center would have to carry a very heavy load: It would be responsible for everything. This system would hardly be suitable for a city like Moscow, which has a population of 9 million people.

The third scheme comes somewhere between the first two. Under this scheme, the Moscow Soviet would only be responsible for management of the city center, while the rayons would be given independence and enjoy an autonomous existence. This scheme has the advantage that it opens up great opportunities for the capital to realize its functions, but it does also have its problems and contradictions.

Finally, the fourth scheme. It is modeled along American lines. It envisages a detailed distribution of functions at all levels: It clearly states the responsibilities of the city, the rayons, and residential districts. Under this system, there are virtually no questions that have to be coordinated. Each authority concerned makes the final decision within the limits of its competence. In theory, this scheme seems to be the best. But it is probably unrealistic for Moscow. The fact is that the American system can function successfully only in the conditions of private ownership.

Whatever scheme the deputy corps elects as a basis, the city management system must be urgently restructured, the Moscow Soviet chairman said. Clearly, the transition to a market system increases the need to make far-reaching transformations. The deteriorating general situation in the city also demands this. If the scheme chosen by deputies envisages a stronger role for Moscow Soviet, this certainly does not mean that the entire range of questions decided by the Soviet must be broadened. On the contrary, Moscow Soviet intends to carry out maximum decentralization. The only subject to be discussed is: Who should have the last word.

Yaroslav Protests RSFSR Finance Ministry Act

PM1409092490 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Nikolay Lashkevich under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Will the Ministry of Finance Return the Millions?"]

[Text] Yaroslavl—A session of Yaroslavl City Soviet has protested at the flagrant violation of local soviets' rights by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Finance Ministry.

Just like in the bad old days of stagnation, the ministry arbitrarily removed 9.4 million rubles from the Yaroslavl budget with a single stroke of the pen even though this is additional income which, according to the law, may not be taken away and is to be used at the discretion of the local soviets.

Incidentally, these millions were going to be used to augment the meager pay of doctors, teachers, and librarians, as had already been announced in Yaroslavl. But now, as Viktor Volonchunas, chairman of the city soviet executive committee, said from the rostrum at the session, the Finance Ministry's unexpected action means that the pay raise will have to be canceled because the city simply has not got the money. A dramatic situation.

In reply to the mayor's speech, one people's deputy seriously suggested that the city soviet take the Finance Ministry to court. Admittedly, such a radical suggestion did not win support. In its decision the session merely urged the USSR Supreme Soviet "...to take measures against the RSFSR Ministry of Finance, which has violated Article 18, Point 2 of the USSR Law 'On the general principles of local self-management and the local economy in the USSR.'"

What will happen next? Will the Finance Ministry return the millions to Yaroslavl?

Tatar Deputy Discusses Sovereignty Declaration

PM1209160190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Sep 90 p 1

[Interview with Rustam Khafizov, Tatar SSR people's deputy, reported by V. Vishnevskiy under "Topical!" rubric: "Freedom? It Is Not Frightening"—place and date not given; first two paragraphs are Vishnevskiy introduction]

[Text] The news published the other day that the Tatar SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] has adopted state sovereignty aroused heightened interest in our readers. They ask: How do people in the former autonomous republic understand state sovereignty? Won't the new status lead to a deterioration in interethnic relations? Whose subject is the Republic of Tatarstan from now on?

We present our interlocutor. Tatar SSR People's Deputy Rustam Khafizov, chairman of the Tatar SSR Supreme Soviet Legislation, Legality, Law and Order, and Privileges Commission. A candidate of Juridical Sciences. Senior scientific staffer of the Kazan Scientific Center's Economics Department.

[Khafizov] Many quarrels are taking place about state sovereignty. They even talk of "the latest versions"—the Komi ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], Karelian ASSR, Mari ASSR.... In our view, the essence of sovereignty lies in developing a system of ownership by the people of the republic with a view to achieving prosperity for them. This is the main thing. After all, what do we have today? While possessing considerable natural, labor, and intellectual resources, the republic is not able to satisfy the simple requirements of its population of 4 million. And this is despite the fact that the volume of its production, its global social product, exceed the indicators of many Union republics, and agricultural productivity is double the all-Union level. As we can see, a large contribution. But the return? How can we talk of people's prosperity when 80 percent of the volume of Tataria's production constitutes military-industrial complex output and production technology output?

Thus by state sovereignty we understand the right to the autonomous determination of the republic's development priorities. And in all spheres, be it credit and finance or foreign policy activity, questions of nature exploitation, the ecology, or the cultural sphere. There is only one path here—the democratization of society's political system, privatization of the economy, destateization of property, and the introduction of market mechanisms.

It must be said that the idea of state sovereignty has taken shape among the Tatar people over the years. I will recall the fact that to this day the Tatar people constitute the second largest nation (7 million people) in Russia. So the declaration of a sovereign state, the Republic of Tatarstan—which was envisaged as far back as 1919—is a profoundly natural step; one achieved through suffering.

I personally do not share fears connected with possible conflicts on interethnic grounds. Although the sad experience of recent years makes one very cautious in this respect. I do not share these fears because, first, over the last hundred years an absolutely unique community has developed on the territory of the republic among the peoples of the Volga region. Second, let us turn once again to the Declaration of State Sovereignty. Surely it guarantees equal rights for all the republic's citizens, irrespective of their social, national, and other differences? Undoubtedly it does. Likewise it guarantees the equality of the Tatar and Russian languages as the state languages, as well as the preservation and development of the languages of other nations. Finally, we believe that state sovereignty, based on the sovereignty of the individual, assists the formation of autonomous masters of the land. I emphasize—autonomous. Again, irrespective of their nationality, belief, and so forth. For such people, interethnic conflicts have no basis.

The last question: whose subject Tatarstan is to be. The topic is a delicate one. In the initial draft declaration a dual status was enshrined for the republic: It was recognized as being simultaneously a subject of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and of the USSR. However, during discussion of the draft, the majority of deputies rejected the idea as juridically worthless. What could replace it? The following conclusion was reached after long debates: The Tatar SSR reserves the right to conclude with other sovereign republics a treaty on setting up a union of sovereign states. And to define autonomously the conditions of its participation in this union.

Volgograd Rally Warns Against 'Terror'

PM1409140990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by own correspondent V. Kornev: "Echo of Rally on Central Embankment"]

[Text] Volgograd—A rally organized by the "Civic Action" movement was held on Volgograd's Central Embankment on Sunday. The parties which make up "Civic Action" enjoy the right of complete independence.

On this occasion, Social Democrats, Christian Democrats, and representatives of other parties gathered on the Central Embankment to express their attitude to terror and violence. The rally was timed to coincide with a specific date in our history: the declaration of the Red terror in response to the White terror.

Although harsh, sometimes unobjective statements were made, one main idea ran through the speeches of the organizers and many of the participants, on the whole: Democratic forces must not allow human lives and society to be threatened by the danger of terror of any hue.

The priest of the Mikhaylovskiy Saint Nicholas Church, Father Dmitriy, gave a brief requiem in memory of the dead. Then the leader of the local branch of the Christian Democrats urged that every possible support be given to the oblast soviet of people's deputies. "This is because certain forces would like to use the shortage of tobacco products—and now the disruption in bread supplies as well—to discredit the new soviets and weaken their authority," he said. "But let us soberly assess the situation: We should call the soviets to account for their shortcomings but not blame them for shortages which have other causes."

It was also suggested at the rally that application be made to the oblast soviet for permission to build (or, to be more precise, rebuild, because it existed before) the Alexander Cathedral on the site of a neglected square in the city center. People felt that the church diocese should be asked to give it the status of the "Savior of the Blood" Temple so that it becomes a place of remembrance for all people who have died on Volga soil, irrespective of which side of the barricades life placed them at that bleak and turbulent time.

Another matter that has long been discussed in Volgograd was also raised: the renaming of the city. The rally participants favored restoring the old name of Tsaritsyn. The city carried this name for several centuries from the day it was founded. The question of renaming Voroshilovskiy Rayon—named in honor of the "Great Leader's" comrade-in-arms—was also discussed. It was proposed to review street names from the same viewpoint.

I must point out that on the eve of this rally it was very strongly rumored that its participants would be calling for the virtual persecution of Communists. There was certainly some sharp criticism of the Communist Party, which is natural: The parties that make up "Civic Action" do not stand on Communist platforms. So the rally on the Central Embankment echoed the processes taking place in society. Although offensive to some ears, the proposals made at the rally demanded efforts to try to understand rather than automatically negate, as in the past. After all, those who addressed the rally and made the proposals mentioned above included deputies from the oblast and city soviets—people who are certainly not interested in destablizing the situation. Contrary to people's fears, the majority of the speakers condemned terror. This, incidentally, is backed up by one of the points in the rally resolution. It is directly concerned with stabilizing the economic and political situation. Rally participants spoke in support of the measures being taken to this end by the new Russian leadership.

Vladimir Oblast Takes Privatization Steps

PM1409145190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report from Vladimir filed by own correspondent Anatoliy Yershov under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Commodity Exchange Established"]

[Text] A service in charge of the privatization of state property and the development of small enterprises in the oblast is being created by decision of the Vladimir Oblast Soviet Presidium.

"No inflation of the apparatus is envisaged," said Yu. Dmitriyev, chief of the oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] Main Administration for Economic Planning. Given the burgeoning market relations, we have been improving the structure and functions of the bulk of our departments and subdivisions, and some of them are being eliminated altogether. As for the new service, it will initially be concerned with developing a mechanism to transfer small public catering, trade, and consumer enterprises into private ownership.

"We are convinced that the formation of a new free market should start 'from below,' at local level. Therefore we recently established a commodity exchange which will be able to sell material resources at contract prices. A joint-stock commercial bank is also being set up to issue credit to private farmers on preferential terms...."

Chechen-Ingush Ethnic Tension Reported

Refugees Flee to Groznyy

LD0709164290 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] An ethnic conflict is flaring up in the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic in northern Caucasus. The settlers from Kazakhstan have been arriving in Groznyy, the republic's capital.

An insignificant part of the (Aboryans) was deported on Stalin's order and is now trying to return to its homeland. Its representatives have pitched a tent down at Groznyy to demand housing and work for the resettlers.

In some parts of the city unidentified persons have been breaking into the homes of ethnic Russians, forcing them to leave the republic.

'Outsiders' Told To Leave

PM1009110190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Sep 90 First Edition p 1

[Major D. Alekseyev report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "More Refugees"]

[Text] Groznyy—Since the persecution of Chechens and Ingushes began in south Kazakhstan their mass migration to Chechen-Ingushetia has been expected.

The first refugees have already appeared in the republic. For example, they have set up an encampment in a residential district of Groznyy, and representatives of the indigenous nationality are demanding that all outsiders leave the republic. In a number of rayons of Groznyy unidentified people in militia uniform have been visiting the apartments of the Russian-speaking population, demanding that they leave and setting specific dates ranging from a week to a month. Rumors of mass disorders have circulated around town. In this connection the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet has appealed to the Kazakh leadership.

Vologda Police Expose Extortion Gang

PM1109133190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Sep 90 Second Edition p 6

[N. Bulavintsev report under "Crime Chronicle" rubric: "Criminal Gang in Uniform"]

[Text] Vologda Oblast—Staffers of the Vologda Oblast KGB Administration, prosecutor's office, and Internal Affairs Administration in recent days carried out two simultaneous large-scale operations to expose and arrest dangerous criminals. We asked Major General L. Arabkov, chief of Vologda Oblast KGB Administration, to speak about these operations.

[Arabkov] The crime situation in Cherepovets, a large industrial center in the oblast, had long been a source of well-founded concern for the law enforcement organs. Recently V. Papushoy, a temporary employee of the Struggle Against Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation Department, was caught red-handed. He had been very persistently extorting money from newly arriving cooperative members in the city market.

During the subsequent investigation an entire criminal group permanently engaged in extortion, bribery, and speculation was exposed. There were eight people in this group. They included M. Bugirov, deputy chief of the regional division of the transport police. In addition to him, other staffers of the Struggle Against Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation Department and the Criminal Investigation Department also turned out to be in the criminal group. They have now all been arrested. It is possible to say today that members of the criminal group enlisted "guerrillas" and members of the underworld to extort money from cooperative members and pressure them. In addition, exploiting their official position, participants in the criminal group systematically bought up goods in heavy demand from stores in order to resell them at exorbitant prices.

An investigation is currently being carried out into this case, and the facts of this group's criminal activity are being exposed.

I will add to the above that, together with oblast prosecutor's office and Internal Affairs Administration employees we also arrested M. Karpov, vice president of the large cooperative association "Slavyanka." He was charged under the note to Article 93 of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Criminal Code, which denotes embezzlement on a particularly large scale. In the course of 1989 alone, this enterprising cooperative member and smart operator appropriated through various machinations a large part of cooperative members' earnings. The sum he appropriated exceeds 90,000 rubles. A large part of this money has already been returned to the state.

Maritime Province Official Discusses Development

OW1609060090 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0200 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] In a speech he delivered in Vladivostok four years ago, Gorbachev in particular mentioned the development of the Soviet Union's Far East region. A year after the speech, the government approved a long-term plan for the development of the Far East region through the year 2000. The question of establishing free management zones in the Far East region has been mentioned on many occasions. Following is an interview by station reporter Mikhaylov with (Bakhnin), vice chairman in charge of the economic affairs of the Maritime Province Executive Committee, on the prospects for establishing free management zones in the Maritime Province.

[Begin (Bakhnin) recording in Russian fading into Mandarin translation] There are excellent prospects for establishing free management zones in the Maritime Province. This region is endowed with rich natural resources and with a proximity to Japan, China, North and South Korea, both favorable conditions for the establishment of free management zones. It should be pointed out that Vladivostok already has utilized these favorable factors to a certain extent when it developed extensive relations with the Asian and Pacific countries at the beginning of this century. With the participation of scholars, the Maritime Province has drafted a concrete plan, which includes the development of cultural and educational ties and the establishment of stock exchange markets in Vladivostok. However, our plan has encountered some obstacles. First and foremost, the plan lacks a legal foundation. As a matter of fact, all Soviet laws discourage the establihsment of free management zones. These laws obstruct not only Soviet but also foreign entrepreneurs from setting up a better economic system. Therefore, we are anxiously awaiting the adoption of laws permitting the establishment of free management zones as well as other laws by the parliament of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic so that we can develop various forms of ownership and become the real masters of our region.

There are other problems. Regrettably, a common stand regarding the military installations in the Maritime Province has not yet been worked out between the Maritime Province and the leading military department in Moscow. We believe that normal relations between the military authority and the local government are needed to make it possible for each side to fulfill its obligations. A main task facing us today is the construction of modern ground facilities such as guesthouses and an international airport. As far as this question is concerned, we have already received some interesting suggestions from China and South Korea. I believe that it is time to prepare for the establishment of joint ventures. Foreign partners and our entrepreneurs, cooperatives, share-holding companies, and state enterprises are making preparations. We have the potential for vigorous advance. [end recording]

Komi Oil Concern To Work With Foreign Firms

PM1309103790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Sep 90 Second Edition p 3

[PRAVDA-TASS report under "Streamer" rubric: "Petrodollars Have Appeared"]

[Text] The "Komineft" Association has established business cooperation with many foreign firms: Italy's Agip, Canada's Galo [name as transliterated], Finland's Neste joint-stock company, and others. This partnership will enable the oil workers to achieve fuller extraction of "black gold" from the earth's interior beyond the Arctic Circle.

The republic's oilmen intend to use the currency obtained from foreign economic activity to purchase abroad the latest medical apparatus, wheelchairs, and disposable syringes and to hand them over to city hospitals in Ukhta and Usinsk. "Komineft" will obtain from abroad manufacturing equipment for milk processing and cheese production for its own departmental state farms.

Leningrad Shipping Firm Transfers to Lease Status

LD1309080590 Moscow TASS in English 0746 GMT
13 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Frolov]

[Text] Leningrad September 13 TASS—The Baltic shipping line in Leningrad has spurned the Soviet Ministry of Merchant Marine and gone it alone. The Soviet Government has decided to to transfer vessels owned by the line, some waterfront installations and a repair shipyard to the firm.

The company is one of the largest in Soviet merchant navy. The total deadweight of its fleet is nearly two million tonnes.

Its dry cargo ships regularly sail to ports of all continents and along the northern sea route. The line's car and passenger ferries are constantly shuttling between Leningrad, Stockholm and Helsinki.

"The present centralised management system is very cumbersome, often leading to a loss of profitable contracts in the stiff competition on the world freight market," shipping line chief Viktor Kharchenko told TASS.

"In the present situation, virtually all the above-the-plan profits of our firm were pocketed by the ministry which used them to support loss-making enterprises."

Kharchenko said that the new status enables the firm to determine independently which cargo flow is the most rational, to choose contractors and to replace outdated vessels quickly.

The firm is already building vessels for a barge-towing system for the USSR-Sweden line in West German shipyards. These vessels wil be the property of the firm's seamen.

By-passing the ministry, the firm is conducting talks on a joint shipping pool with several European shipowners.

"After becoming leaseholders, seamen won the right to be equal partners with the ministry. Another important thing: Leningraders can now give some profits to the fund of their native city," Kharchenko stressed.

Taking into account the declared programme for privatisation in the USSR, there will be a sale of state property. The shipping line intends to distribute this property among its shareholders.

Nakhodka Port Reconstruction Begins

LD1609224790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
2100 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Summary] Reconstruction of Nakhodka commercial port has begun without halting goods handling. The sea wall, which is almost two km long, is to be extended by 58 meters. The port will be able to handle bigger ships, with displacement of up to 30,000 tonnes. It is planned to hand over two new deep-water berths next year, complete with mechanized warehousing and cargo transfer conveyers. This will make it possible to increase by several times the goods turnover of Nakhodka international commercial seaport, which is preparing for work as part of a free economic zone.

Murmansk Sailors Strike for More Pay

LD0609101690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0800 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Text] It is reported from Murmansk that sailors of atomic-powered vessels on the Northern Sea route have gone out on strike. They have been joined by crews of other icebreakers and a number of transport vessels of the Murmansk Shipping Line. The sailors are striking over the government's refusal to meet demand for the regulation of pay for work in the Arctic. They are paid considerably less than sailors on vessels on foreign routes who, in addition, receive part of their salary in hard currency. As a result, qualified specialists are leaving atomic-powered vessels causing staffing problems. Unless the government takes measures after this 24-hour strike, the sailors intend to halt the vessels' reactors.

Northwest Customs Department Established

LD1109224590 Moscow TASS in English 1655 GMT 11 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Kondratenko]

[Text] Leningrad September 11 TASS—A new customs department in charge of northwest Russia has been set up in Leningrad. The department's sphere of activity includes Arkhangelsk, Kaliningrad, Murmansk, Novgorod and Pskov regions and the Karel autonomous republic.

The new department is headed by Vladimir Bobkov, the senior customs official at Leningrad's Pulkovo International Airport in the past few years.

"The creation of the north-western department has been necessitated by radical changes in the country's economic structure and increased possibilities of independently entering the world market," Bobkov told reporters.

"In the conditions of rigid centralisation, all customs operations were conducted on the state border. Now we have been given the right to control the movement of exports and imports within the country."

Bobkov said one of the department's top priority tasks was the organisation of a computer centre, which will be the main element of a system of monitoring the movement of freight and goods.

Package Mail Into Moscow Suspended

PM1109124190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Sep 90 p 1

[A. Monakhov report: "Henceforward You Will Not Even Send... About a New USSR Communications Ministry Order"]

[Text] Having heard about the shortage of flour and other foodstuffs in the capital, many relatives of Muscovites decided to organize a food supply to the center using their own resources. But, alas... It turns out that, by order of USSR First Deputy Communications Minister Kudryavtsev, it is forbidden for a time to accept packages addressed to Moscow and Moscow Oblast.

Nina Brykina, leading engineer at the Communications Ministry, explained the situation:

"The situation is difficult at the stations now—railroad workers are 'upsetting' the schedules, and packages arrive extremely irregularly. But the chief reason for the ban lies elsewhere—some mail vehicles have been sent to assist collective farm workers.

"Our ministry has also ordered that packages should not be allowed out of Moscow in the direction of the Crimea and Kiev."

Russian Radio, Television Plans Disclosed

LD1209131690 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 12 Sep 90

[Text] The president of Russia's television and radio company, (Oleg Poptsov), has said that its chief task is a frontal breakthrough to democracy in the republic. He disclosed in a press interview that Russian radio would become fully operational as of 15 October and television as of 1 January. Some of the Moscow and Leningrad TV celebrities have expressed a wish to join Russia's television and radio company, which according to (Poptsov) will be likely to become a joint-stock enterprise.

Western Republics

British Observe Belorussia Military Exercise

LD1509090390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0725 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Leonid Tratsevskiy]

[Text] Minsk, 15 Sep (TASS)—In the period from 10 to 15 September, a military exercise of units of the Belorussian Military District was held in the territory of Belorussia for the purpose of improving the field training of troops and practicing aspects of control and interaction. Formations and units of land and air forces were involved in the exercise.

In accordance with the Stockholm Conference document, the USSR Government had given notification of it to the CSCE participating states. On the basis of the same document, the USSR Government had satisfied the British Government's request of 11 September 1990 to carry out an inspection in the Belorussian Military District. A four-person inspection group from Britain observed the course of the exercise, which ended strictly on time. At present the troops are returning to the places where they are permanently stationed.

Debates Continue on Gagauz, Dnestr Sovereignty

Snegur Addresses Rally

LD1609203590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Report on interview with Mircha Snegur, president of the Moldavian Republic, by A. Barkhatov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] There has been a large national gathering in Dubossary, a rayon center in Moldova, attended by hundreds of delegates from various towns and villages of the republic.

[Begin recording] [Barkhatov] Snegur, the president of the republic, and Druk, chairman of the Council of Ministers, addressed the rally which was attended by many thousand people and organized by the regional committee for the integrity of Moldova.

The fact is that there exists a proclamation, of two, let's say provisional [uslovnoye] and, as the Supreme Soviet of Moldova has declared, illegal republics: the Gagauz one, whose deputies have gathered today for a congress, and what is called the Dnestr republic. What are your plans now? To find a compromise on certain conditions? When will it be time for talks?

[Snegur] I would like to note that neither one nor the other of the republics you named exists in fact, because the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Moldova annulled those so-called decisions, and therefore they have no force in law. It is evidently as a result of these high-level measures that have been taken that so many people have gathered today to express their opposition to the dismemberment of the republic. Now you used the word talks. I, for example, reject the concept of talks, because on the territory of our republic, with soviets subordinate in the hierarchy—and I want to say that the leaders are indeed the heads of soviets, there the concept of talks, well, don't take offense, but they are out of place and inappropriate. The word compromise, which you used, is a different matter. Yes, that is a word which is used when it is necessary to....

[Barkhatov, interrupting] Achieve agreement?

[Snegur] Yes, achieve agreement. A compromise whereby people should give up their autonomous, separatist convictions, and at their request and at our insistence, go on working to solve the question. I want to say that there are by no means fewer problems in our little republic than there are in big republics. What worries the whole country today is the same as what worries us. [end recording]

Gagauz Leader Arrested

LD1609184190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[INTERFAX report: "Gagauz Leader Arrested"]

[Text] A leader of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic Prosecutor's Office, speaking on national television and radio, has announced the arrest of Leonid Dobrov, one of the leaders of the new Gagauz organization "Arkalyk."

In his words, this extreme radical organization has declared the beginning of a "holy war" against those Moldavians who, it alleges, "want to "bring the Gagauz people to their knees." It even announced the date that actions would begin—17 September. As the prosecutor's office spokesman stated, "Arkalyk's" first planned "terrorist" actions are to take Moldavian parliamentary deputies hostage and to carry out a similar operation at the Moldavian mission in Moscow with the aim of "alerting world public opinion to the problems of the Gagauzes."

Components Differ Over Draft

PM1409112790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Sep 90 First Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent Captain Third Rank V. Yermolin under the "Direct Line" rubric: "USSR Laws Remain in Force"]

[Text] Tiraspol—The newspaper SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA has published the Moldovan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet resolution "On Military Service by Citizens of the Moldovan SSR." Readers learned from the preamble to it "that one of the factors influencing the destabilization of the sociopolitical situation in the republic recently has been the population's negative attitude toward service by Moldovan SSR citizens in the ranks of the USSR Armed Forces.... Many return from military service as invalids.... Unable to stand the constant taunts and torture and the humiliation of honor and personal dignity, citizens [illegible] the republic, particularly those of Moldavian nationality, go AWOL from military units and return home...." The establishing section goes on to state: "The operation of Articles 31, 62, and 63 of the USSR Constitution and the USSR Law of 12 October 1967 'On Compulsory Military Service' is to be suspended on the territory of the Moldovan SSR." In addition, "it is to be laid down that citizens of the Moldovan SSR are not drafted into the ranks of the USSR Armed Forces for active military service." The resolution prescribes a deadline for all Moldovan SSR citizens currently serving in the USSR Armed Forces to return to Moldovan territory before 15 October 1990 "to perform the remainder of their service in military units and subunits located on Moldovan SSR territory." This resolution came into force the day it was adopted.

As is known, the republic Supreme Soviet has adopted a decision to create a national army of the Moldovan SSR. The resolution provides for the draft into its own army to begin in the spring of 1991.

This document has caused alarm and indignation in the recently proclaimed Dnestr Moldavian SSR and Gagauz republic.

"On the territory of the Gagauz republic," Stepan Mikhaylovich Topal, head of the provisional committee of the Gagauz republic, told me, "service in the USSR Armed Forces was and still is an honorable duty."

The leadership of the Gagauz republic, like that of the Dnestr Moldavian SSR, is ready to give assistance to local military commissariats to carry out the fall draft into the ranks of the USSR Armed Forces.

For us," Igor Nikolayevich Smirnov, chairman of the provisional Supreme Soviet of the Dnestr Moldavian SSR, assured me, "the USSR Constitution, like the

USSR laws, is unshakable. I am sure that the fall draft will take place in our republic, as usual, in an organized manner."

Leaders Back Political Solution

LD1409134190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] The five-day time limit in which the extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic recommended the leaders of the Gagauz and Dnestr republics to abrogate the decisions of the congresses that had proclaimed them has run out. Mashanu, chairman of the Moldova Supreme Soviet, believes it is not worth hurrying to adopt some administrative or repressive measure, as it might further aggravate the situation. The residents of the republics, which were proclaimed by separatists, are beginning to understand they were misled. They are addressing us with requests to continue the search for a solution of the problems by political methods.

The head of the Moldova's parliament especially notes the need for the creation of a complex program for the stabilization of the situation in the republic, which is already being drawn up.

Soviet Debates Separatism

PM1409140190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent S. Gamova: "No Dialogue"]

[Text] Kishinev—The Moldovan Supreme Soviet session has resumed work. On the agenda is the sociopolitical situation in the republic, which has been complicated by the proclamation of the Gagauz Soviet Socialist Republic and the Dnestr Moldavian Republic.

Parliamentary deputy groups have visited these regions to clarify the situation and establish ways to solve the present political crisis. The group leaders submitted reports to the Supreme Soviet on the results of their visit. According to them, people living in villages in the south and the Dnestr region have said that the main causes of the present situation are the Moldova People's Front Congress decision to join Romania, the proposal to rename the republic the Romanian Republic of Moldova, the forced pace at which language laws are being adopted, the low level of social development in these regions, and insufficient information on parliamentary affairs.... A number of southern regions where Gagauz and Bulgarians form the bulk of the population are unable to receive television and radio broadcasts in Russian. People's wish to meet the Moldovan president and the republic's prime minister was conveyed to the session, as well as the request that the Supreme Soviet speed up the adoption of laws on a referendum, migration, and citizenship.

The session heard a considerable number of constructive proposals calling for understanding of the problems of people living in the south and the Dnestr region but also urging the use of legal sanctions—including criminal punishment—against the leaders of both proclaimed republics.

Addressing the session, Mircha Druk, prime minister of the republic, said that the Moldovan government and Supreme Soviet have never aimed to join the republic to neighboring Romania. The well-known Moldovan poet Ion Vatamanu urged deputies to mutual understanding, a differentiated approach, and efforts to soberly resolve the political problems that have arisen.

However, speeches calling for civil reconciliation and compromise were counterbalanced by quite a number of demands that force be used immediately to make the south and the left bank obey the Moldovan Constitution and that the right of presidential rule be exercised in these territories—in other words, that a state of emergency be introduced. The justification given for this is to prevent the republic breaking up and to put a stop to separatist movements.

After lengthy debate the session adopted a resolution which proposes that the Dnestr and Gagauz peoples call their deputies to congress and abolish their earlier decisions within one week.

Gagauz 'Republic' Congress Held

LD1609141390 Moscow TASS in English 1354 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Text] Komrat September 16 TASS—The second congress of people's deputies was held today in the city of Komrat in the southwest of the Soviet Union, where on August 19, the first congress of people's deputies of all levels from districts where people of the Gagauz nationality live in compact communities proclaimed the Gagauz Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR].

The congress was attended by 729 deputies, according to organisers.

It heard a report from the provisional republican committee on the political situation in the Republic of Moldova and approved documents confirming the policy worked out by the first congress of Gagauz people's deputies insisting on the recognition of the status of the Gagauz Union republic.

Participants in the congress adopted an appeal to President Mikhail Gorbachev and Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov and instructed the provisional republican committee to form a delegation to meet the country's leaders.

The congress was addressed by representatives of the other newly proclaimed republic in Moldova—the Dnestr one. People's deputies of the SSR of Moldova, who attended the congress to work with its participants on the instructions from the republican parliament, were not given the opportunity to address the congress.

Moldavian Communist Leader Urges Union Treaty

LD1609082890 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Text] To solve ethnic problems in the Soviet Union, a new treaty of the Union should be concluded and market relations introduced as soon as possible. This opinion was expressed by the leader of the Communist Party of Moldova, Pyotr Luchinskiy. According to him, first of all it is necessary to convene a roundtable conference of the communists, and other social-political groups of the government and governing bodies.

Kharkov Oblast Committee Elects New Secretary

LD1409221490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] A combined plenum of the oblast and city committees of the Communist Party of the Ukraine was held today in Kharkov. It discussed two issues: preparations for the oblast party conference, and improving the structure of the oblast party organization. The plenum adopted, by a majority, a decision to abolish the Kharkov City Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, and transfer its functions to the oblast committee of the party. At the same time, before the second stage of the oblast party conference, set for November of this year, the membership of the secretariat of the oblast committee has been expanded.

Oleg Alekseyevich Demin, formerly secretary of the Kharkov Party City Committee, was elected as the new secretary of the Kharkov Oblast Committee of the Party.

Church Officials Discuss Conflict in Ukraine

LD1409211290 Moscow TASS in English 2101 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Anna Grigoryeva and Aleksandr Budris]

[Text] Moscow September 15 TASS—A four-day meeting of representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church ended here on Friday. Its participants discussed a conflict situation in the church life of Western Ukraine.

It was reported at a press conference after the end of the meeting that it had not adopted a final document. According to Metropolitan of Kiev and Galich Filaret, exarch of the Ukraine, who led the delegation of the Russian Orthodox Church, one of the reasons for it was that representatives of Greek Catholics from Lvov and Ivano-Frankovsk had refused to comply with the request of the delegation of the Russian Orthodox Church and give its believers one church in each of the two cities from among those that are functioning there.

"The talks were not fruitful for the Orthodox side," Metropolitan Filaret said. "We are not giving up our quest for ways to settle the crisis in Western Ukraine and are ready to display understanding."

The delegation of the Roman Catholic Church was led by Archbishop Eduard Cassidi, chairman of the Papal Council for Promoting Christian Unity. At the request of this delegation, Greek Catholic Archbishop Vladimir (Sternyuk) from Lvov was invited to the meeting.

Caucasus

Armenian State of Emergency Still in Effect

Ter-Petrosyan Cited on ANA

PM1409134290 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 36, 16-23 Sep 90 p 4

[Report on interview with Armenian Supreme Soviet Chairman Levon Ter-Petrosyan, by Dmitriy Radyshevskiy; place and date not given: "Armenia: No Civil War"]

[Text] I first visited Yerevan's Freedom Square on May 30. The city was bidding farewell to the fidains who had died defending the motherland. Mainly these were the vigilantes of the Armenian National Army (ANA). I revisited this square three months later. Again the burial bells, scorching heat and the silent crowd with raised fists. Again standing near the coffin were men with submachine guns in semi-military uniform. But this time they were burying a deputy to Armenia's Supreme Soviet, killed by one of the ANA's armed detachments. On August 28 the Supreme Soviet of Armenia decided to impose a state of emergency in the republic and a curfew and to disarm the ANA.... These actions puzzled some. In Yerevan I was asked why the ANA had killed an unarmed deputy? Aren't the ANA soldiers patriots who defend the honour and freedom of Armenia? Why this state of emergency? Can't they fit the ANA into state structures? These trigger-happy young people, will they disarm without a fight? Won't they push Armenia into civil war?

I addressed these questions to Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Armenia.

"What lawful government would tolerate people armed illegally? The former government of communists tolerate them, since it was interested in instability. But we realize that without stability we cannot be a serious political partner for Azerbaijan or for Moscow. Therefore, we went further than the USSR president's decree on disarmament, and adopted a resolution to disarm all military formations arbitrarily set up in Armenia. They didn't believe that we would be able to stabilize the situation in this way. But we did it.

"We didn't set ourselves the task of integrating the ANA into state structures. Together with honest people many criminals penetrated that army. Possibly, it included the forces which would like, by resorting to provocations, to frustrate the democratization of Armenia. That it was essential to disarm the ANA became clear when the fatally wounded Albadzhan and Mikaelyan, who had come for talks, were found near its headquarters. And investigation is under way.

"Two years ago the ANA was genuinely useful to Armenia, defending our borders when the Soviet Army failed to take action. But recently the ANA's actions have run counter to our policy of peaceful settlement of the conflict with Azerbaijan and reached the peak in recent skirmishes near Noemberyan. Some ANA soldiers, together with the fighters of the Armenian Liberation Movement (ALM) and other armed formations will voluntarily and individually join the state structures—the MVD, KGB, the Voluntary Society for Assisting the Army, Air Force and Navy, detachments of civil defence. There will be no independent armed formations.

"The ANA as an organization exists no more. Its members, if they are really patriots of Armenia, must realize that to resist the disarming process is a stab in the back for Armenia. Those who fail to understand this [illegible] remain in the minority and the struggle against them won't develop into a civil war. Although there still exists the danger of separate terrorist acts....

"The people favour the disarmament of the vigilantes. Our policy is undermined only by official structures. In this connection, the chairman of Armenia's KGB was removed from his post.

"In stabilizing the situation in Armenia, we naturally hoped that Azerbaijan would respond accordingly. But the day the ANA was disarmed, Azerbaijani authorities with the connivance of the Internal Troops started preparations for the deportation of residents of the Armenian village Getashen, in the Khanvar District of Azerbaijan. Azerbaijan is taking similar action in the Shaumyan District of Azerbaijan, mainly populated by Armenians. Despite this, we are ready to start negotiations with Azerbaijan.

"The situation in Armenia is returning to normal. The tension is lower. There are no armed people in the streets, as there were a month ago. Under the state of emergency, local militia patrol the city streets at night.

"For the first time in recent years, Yerevan is not seething. It is quiet in the city, there is no sharp division between the supporters of the ANA and of the ALM. Today Armenians are concerned about the lack of petrol and cigarettes. Legislators trusted by the people are coming to power in Armenia. Their first triumph is in having averted a civil war."

Curfew Reduced Two Hours

LD1409210890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] The curfew in Yerevan has been reduced by two hours. With the imposition of the state of emergency, notes the republic's internal affairs minister, Kazaryan, the number of crimes—especially serious crimes involving the use of arms—has noticably declined. No cases have been recorded of exacerbation of the situation from interethnic motives, although such isolated instances as conflicts on adjoining pastures are still occurring.

Trade Union Council Ends Ties to CPSU

NC1409103790 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1850 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Text] A conference of the primary party organization at the Armenian republican trade unions council discussed the issue of party decontrol of the council apparatus and unanimously decided to dissolve the primary party organization.

A number of republican rural trade union committees have already been freed from the party control.

Tension Continues on Armenia-Azerbaijan Border

TV Building Rocked by Bomb

LD1509100390 Moscow TASS in English 1008 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Stepanakert September 15 TASS—A television and radio center was blown up in Stepanakert, the administrative center of the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region, on Friday night.

According to preliminary reports, the bomb was planted in the center's basement. No one was injured. The damage has been estimated at tens of thousands of rubles.

Catholicos Appeal to Gorbachev

LD1409163690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] The office of Catholicos Vazgen I of all the Armenians announced today an appeal by him to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the USSR president.

The message says that the situation of the Armenian population in Nagorno-Karabakh has become tragic in church life, too. We are appealing to you, Vazgen I stresses, in the hope that the force of the law will put an end to the tragic events in the autonomous oblast.

Azerbaijan Sends Protest Note

LD1509132290 Moscow TASS in English 1314 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Baku September 15 AZERINFORM-TASS—The Azerbaijani Foreign Ministry has addressed a note of protest to neighbouring Armenia.

It states that for the past two-and-a-half years the Azerbaijani Republic has been the subject of continuous aggression on the part of Armenia aimed at territorial dismemberment of the republic.

The note stresses that these actions, including the annexation of a part of the sovereign Azerbaijani territory—the village of Kyarki in the Nakhichevan autonomous republic, are at variance with international law and cannot be regarded as anything short of an aggression by one state against another—a grave international crime in legal terms.

The note resolutely protests against the annexation of the Kyarki village by Armenia.

Clashes continue in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region.

On Friday, a convoy of seven trucks and two busses were stoned and damaged by iron bars while en route via Askeran, a Karabakh district centre populated by Armenians.

The vehicles were then wrecked and the drivers and some passengers were damaged. Some people were hospitalised.

Troops End Hunger Strike

NC1509083190 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] On 13 September the 13 staffers of the Askeranskiy Rayon Party Committee who were on a hunger strike in the party building were able to report on the situation. The participants in this ultimate political action—which is to protest the arbitrary measures taken by the Azerbaijani leadership in that rayon and in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]—said that the representatives of the commandant's office demanded that they evacuate the building because such actions in public places is prohibited during curfew hours. The protesters replied that they do not consider the party rayon committee building to be a public place and refused to comply with the demands of the soldiers.

According to other information, after midnight, soldiers stormed the Askeranskiy Rayon Party Committee building and forcibly evicted the hunger strikers. During the operation Edmond Grigoryan, chairman of the party commission [not further identified], was injured. The rayon party committee building was taken over by the troops. This morning there was no one in the building.

The troops have followed the same well-tested scenario in Martuninskiy Rayon as well. Today, at 0730, the troops resorted to well-known threats and forcibly evicted people, mostly party and soviet apparatus staffers, from the the rayon party committee building. They stated that the Azerbaijani leadership has terminated the operations of the rayon party committee. Here also the building now is under the control of the troops. So far there are no emissaries from Baku in the building.

The leadership of that republic [words indistinct] (?is not inclined to give up) its intentions to dissolve the autonomous oblast. They also are unwilling to restore the local administrations. This only shows that the calls for dialogue made by Azerbaijan (?half a year) ago were merely propagandistic moves. Otherwise, how do they explain the allout effort made by Azerbaijan to undermine the unequivocal call now being made by the Republic of Armenia for a negotiated political solution to the dispute. Azerbaijan demands that negotiations should not include NKAO. Then one wonders what we should discuss. While remaining in the USSR structure, Azerbaijan prefers to disregard the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet on NKAO, (?yet expects the autonomous oblast to submit to Azerbaijan). It is also unclear which laws are binding on the Internal Troops of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry: the Union laws or the Azerbaijani ones?

Come what may, the people of Artsakh [NKAO] will not deviate from their chosen path to follow the supreme law of life. The age of [word indistinct] politicians and stone age national chauvinism will sooner or later (?come to an end).

Yerevan Reports on Incidents

NC1409131290 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 11 Sep 90

[Report by ARMENPRES correspondent M. Margaryan under the heading: "A New Episode in the Game of Oppression"]

[Text] Yerevan, 11 Sep (ARMENPRES)—It was a usual work day at the water pump of Khndzorut village in Vaykskiy Rayon. Two men were on watch in the guard house. In the morning they sighted three persons coming from the direction of the border with Nakhichevan. They turned out to be soldiers. They were received respectfully. They demanded that the chairman of the village soviet and the director of the sovkhoz [state farm] be brought to them to arrange a meeting with the military leadership. Three soldiers again appeared at the guard house of the water pump between 2230-2300. There faces were so camouflaged that it was not clear if they were the morning visitors. However, their tone of speech was definitely different. They shouted haughtily, asking whether their order has been implemented. Hearing that the village leadership has postponed the meeting to ascertain the credentials of the soldiers, they beat up the guard, searched the guard house, seized a hunting rifle and pocket knives, tied the hands of one of the guards and forced the other to march toward the border at gunpoint. When the guard fell to ground because of heart palpitations and refused to go to the Azerbaijani side, he was hit and kicked. However, they were magnanimous enough to spare his life and left.

Such incidents have become quite frequent along the borders of Vaykskiy Rayon. Both the soldiers and the brigands of the so-called Popular Front take hostages, ridicule people, pillage the farms and steal livestock with impunity. Yet, if the defensive Armenian side raises even a sigh it is punished severely and is labeled with scores of "isms" and "ists." The unbridled game of oppression is still continuing.

Extremists Attack Trucks, Buses

NC1709121890 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] The extremists are not behaving themselves. Seven trucks and two buses driving through Askeran in the direction of Khodzhaly, Agdam, and [word indistinct], were attacked (?with stones) on the morning on 14 September. A number of drivers and passengers were wounded in the incident that was caused by the Armenian extremists. They hurled stones and metal pieces at the vehicles on the road.

Mademov, chief of the Khodzhaly Rayon Internal Affairs Department, has informed an AZERINFORM correspondent that the wounded have been given medical treatment. A number of them have been admitted to hospital.

The military servicemen of the Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs have taken measures to establish law and order on the road.

Deterioration in Situation Seen

PM1709095690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[INTERFAX report: "Situation in NKAO"]

[Text] Colonel Ovchinnikov, military commandant of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] state of emergency district, has pointed out that the situation in the autonomous oblast has drastically deteriorated.

His address, published in Stepanakert, stresses that actions by "extremist citizens and hooligan elements" in the rayon centers of Askeran, Gadrut, and Martuni are a destabilizing factor at present. "These actions," the commandant indicates, "involve the gathering of a large number of citizens, the seizure of raykoms [rayon party committees], and threats against military personnel."

Meanwhile, our correspondent pointed out that the arrival in these rayons of representatives of the republic NKAO organizational committee to temporarily replace party raykom first secretaries and apparatuses provoked a sharply negative attitude among the Armenian population. Some 13 Askeranskiy Party Raykom [rayon party committee] staffers went on hunger strike in protest at these actions. Reports that have come in say that the raykom building was occupied Friday by Internal Troops who evicted the hunger strikers. Servicemen occupied the Martuninskiy Party Raykom building on the same day.

New 'Stalin' Group To Contest Georgian Elections

LD1509085290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] A new political organization bearing the symbolic title "Stalin," has appeared in Georgia of late, and although it states that it directs its activity in acordance with the program and rules of the CPSU and shares the decisions of the 28th congress of the party, the organization nevertheless does not recognize the amendment to the USSR Constitution on revoking the leading role of the Communist Party nor amendments to the Georgian constitution on the introduction of a multiparty system.

The "Stalin " organization achieved this right having recently appealed to the Georgian Supreme Court against the Central Electoral Commission's refusal to register it. Some public and political organizations undertook protest actions against the involvement of this grouping in the forthcoming elections.

Central Asia

Kazakhstan Sovereignty Draft Declaration Reviewed

LD1609122990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Text] Kazakhstan is voluntarily uniting with other sovereign republics in the Union and building relations with them, as with the Union, on the basis of a treaty. This is mentioned in the draft declaration published today on the state sovereignty of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. The people of Kazakhstan, who consist of citizens of all nationalities, are recognized as the republic's sole owner. At the same time they are guaranteed the right to preserve their union citizenship. Within its borders the constitution of the law of the Kazakh SSR must be observed and executed by all state bodies, enterprises, establishments, and organizations, irrespective of who they are subordinate to. The Kazakh SSR has the right to suspend on its territory the operation of the laws and other acts of the higher union bodies that violate the rights and the constitution of the republic.

Land, underground reserves, natural resources, economic and scientific, technical, and intellectual potential and all the national wealth on its territory are declared to be in the ownership of the Kazakh SSR. It is forbidden to produce, store, and test nuclear weapons. The republic is creating its own internal troops, the organs of state and public security. It has the right to be an independent body in international relations in every respect. Kazakhstan will preserve its right to freely withdraw from the union in the way established by the law and taking into account the interests of the indigenous nation.

The draft declaration is being submitted for nationwide discussion, after which it will be refined and considered at the republican Supreme Soviet session, which opens in one month.

Nazarbayev Warns of 'Blind Nationalist Ambition'

PM1309144590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 Sept 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report filed from Alma-Ata by correspondent Vladimir Andreyev: "The Constitution Will Be Defended"]

[Text] An appeal to the people of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] entitled "For Unity and Consolidation" has been delivered on republic television by Kazakh President N. Nazarbayev.

While noting that the republic is on the verge of a fundamentally new stage—the signing of a Union treaty as a sovereign state—he voiced his concern that anxiety is growing among the population at the deterioration of interethnic relations. The president acknowledged that "there have appeared in our republic people who interpret the ideas of perestroyka, democratization, and glasnost in a superficial and extremely misguided way," meaning here, as he explained, "the desire to recarve the republic's borders and infringe its territorial integrity." And, on the other hand, the nationalist objectives of a number of informal movements: The fact that "plans to create ethnically based opposition social movements are already advanced" is particularly alarming. "If this happens," Nazarbayev said, "we will face the real danger of a split in society and will become hostages to blind nationalist ambition."

The republic president stated that all demands, appeals, and actions at variance with the constitutional norms will be countered by the law-enforcement agencies. Organizers of interethnic strife, whoever they may be, will be brought to book under the law. He also expressed concern that destabilization of the situation in Kazakhstan could seriously hamper the establishment of the republic's international ties and have a particularly detrimental impact during the transition to a market economy.

Ekibastuz Power Station Explosion Kills Three

PM1409132590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent G. Dildyayev under the rubric "Yesterday's News File" and under general heading "Accidents"]

[Text] Alma-Ata, 13 Sep—There was an explosion at No. 5 power unit of Ekibastuz No. 1 GRES [state regional electric power station] at 1100 hours on 12 September. The power station was on fire. According to specialists, there was an accidental leak of hydrogen which exploded. The turbine disintegrated and its heavy blades flew all over the place.

The fire was put out, but 24 of the station's 44 access staircases burned down and were destroyed. Only two of the eight 500-kilowatt power units are functional. The rest are either destroyed or covered in debris. Power consumption restrictions are in force.

Three Ekibastuz power station workers died and four were hospitalized.

Anotherv explosion (hydrogen again!) occurred at the same time on the same day at Ulbinskiy Metallurgical Plant which is in the center of Ust-Kamenogorsk City. A toxic cloud hung above its residential districts. Access to the streets was possible only for people wearing gas masks. The cloud was dispersed by the wind.

Tajik Supreme Soviet To Publish Newspaper

LD1509130990 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik
1600 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] The Tajik SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet decrees: In order to reflect timely and comrehensively the activity of all spheres of soviets of people's deputies and their role in solving the important social and economic problems in the progress of the republic, an independent newspaper, the organ of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet, shall be organized.

The newspaper, the organ of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet, shall be entitled SADA-YI MARDUM [THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE] and published five times a week in four pages with the A2 format of the newspaper PRAVDA.

Conversion of Turkmen Fertilizer Plant Opposed

PM1409105790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Report by K. Babayev and B. Atayev from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] We have received a report from our Turkmenia correspondent. He added by phone that the Turkmen SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has adopted a resolution based on a question from a people's deputy. It has been decided—or recommended—to examine the question of converting the Turkmen Nitrogenous Fertilizers Plant in the city of Mary to produce ecologically clean output. Union organs will cover the plant's debts.

[Reporter] For six years the wind has been wafting trails of smoke infected with toxic admixtures over all this densely populated area. In nearby villages there has been a sizable increase during this period in people suffering from skin diseases and breathing problems. Some people have simply had their hair fall out. The problem plant was constructed on the "get it built and let them get on with it" principle. But this sloppy construction has continued for more than 10 years—I am referring to the rebuilding work. And, owing to frequent stoppages, the plant stands idle 160 days a year on average, causing colossal losses to the republic. Because of the regular stoppages the cadre turnover has been unprecedented.

The enterprise collective is completely renewed every 30 months. And the lack of experience and suitable qualifications on the part of most of the workers leads in turn to new stoppages and technical violations. Thus, following an explosion last summer, the plant was out of action for around eight months.

What is your attitude toward the deputies' demand that the plant be shut down?

[Yusupovskiy] I think it is abnormal to be closing the plant. First, you have got to find jobs for the people involved—and there are at least 2,000 employees at the plant. And, above all, why should we give our raw material—gas—to someone else when we can process it ourselves? After all, it is no secret that the price of mineral fertilizers and saltpeter on the world market is $150. We can sell this saltpeter abroad, why should we be thinking about sending our gas somewhere else?